

AN ASIATIC REGARDS EUROPE

IT is a long time now since English readers were amused, and partly perhaps made to think, by certain "Letters of John Chinaman." It is a still longer time since Li Hung Chang, the cleverest and perhaps the most feared politician of his day, made his tour of Europe, and summed up his impression in a single criticism.

"What puzzles me about you Europeans," he said, or to this effect were his words, "is only this. You all profess to be Christians, and on that account in some way to be superior to us of the East. When I try to discover what it is to be a Christian, I find that it is to be a follower, a worshipper, an imitator of Christ. But who was Christ? According to your own account He was perhaps the greatest failure in life this world has ever seen. He set out to found a kingdom, and He was put to death as a traitor to His imperial monarch. He set out to reform the morals of His countrymen, and He died 'a malefactor.' His ideal was the unity of the human race, and in the end He had not so much as one to stand by Him.

"But this is not all. You Europeans, you Christians, profess to make much of Him as a man, and to set Him up as the model you admire. On your own showing, what kind of man was He? What kind of life did He lead? I read your accounts and I find that He was born the child of a tramp in something like a ditch, that for some reason I do not understand He had to spend His infancy in exile, that when He did get back to His own country He lived almost all His life in hiding as a common artisan, that later on He went about preaching, but by it made more enemies than friends, that He was always poor, that none but the lowest seemed to want Him, that the upper classes, the rulers, and the rich, and the learned, found Him such a nuisance that at last they agreed to get Him out of the way.

"This is what, as an Asiatic interested in you Europeans, I find to be your talk about the man you say is your ideal and your model. Such a man, you say, has made you. You have learnt from Him; you have followed Him; you

have put His precepts into practice; and on that account you claim to have become superior to us Asiatics.

"And yet, when I look for proofs of this claim, what do I find? You worship a king whose 'kingdom was not of this world';—do you? You worship a good man who died with the reputation of a malefactor;—do you? You worship a leader whose aim was to make the whole world one;—but you will allow that His methods were very different from yours. You set up for your model a pauper's child, a common working-man, a failure; you seem to have a queer way of reproducing your model. If there is one thing you worship more than another it is success. If you have any ideal at all it is to be idle—sometimes you call it to be free,—and to make other people, especially us non-Christian Asiatics, do your work for you. Empire, reputation, wealth,—I find these words in everybody's mouths, accepted as the very pillars of your civilization.

"No; you Europeans must excuse us if we Asiatics look upon you as hypocrites and humbugs. I am sorry to use terms so offensive; it is not our Asiatic way; but you have asked me for my candid opinion and I might as well tell you quite plainly what I think; not only what I think, but what practically every Asiatic thinks who knows anything at all about you."

It is getting on for half a century since this far-seeing Asiatic statesman made his summary criticism. In his own country he had been harassed by European Powers, and had shown himself a match for them all. They had then thought to influence him by the well-known device of inviting him to Europe and dazzling his eyes by all the wonders he would find there. He had come; he had been handed on from country to country, from Government to government. National secrets had been shown to him, above all the making of ships and the casting of guns. Every means had been taken to impress him with the greatness of Christian Europe.—and this was the result! He concluded that Europeans, taken together, were a lot of humbugs; that Christianity, as it revealed itself in practice, was nothing but contemptible hypocrisy.

Nearly half a century has passed since then, and what has happened in the interval? Not very long ago the present writer was standing in the middle of the Coliseum in Rome, occupied with his own thoughts. As he stood there

two men came up to him, very smartly dressed in European clothes, but with decidedly Asiatic faces. They smiled in recognition, and evidently knew him; but for the moment, owing to their dress, he did not recognize them. Presently it dawned upon him who they were; the one was a well-known Indian financier, a Parsee of considerable wealth and much in the counsel of the Indian Government; the other was a student, a friend, who was visiting Europe for the first time. Both were old acquaintances, and had been pupils of the Jesuit Fathers in their University College in Bombay.

For a time we talked lightly of many things, memories happy and otherwise. Then we talked of Rome; and by Rome I soon discovered that my Parsee millionaire meant St. Peter's. He had been to Rome many a time before; he knew its streets and palaces as he knew the streets and palaces of every capital in Europe; but he was emphatic in declaring, much to my astonishment, that the one place in Rome, almost the one place in Europe, to be seen was St. Peter's; that no Asiatic should come to Europe without visiting St. Peter's, that unless he saw St. Peter's he could not really know what Europe was. On this account he had brought his friend to see it before he went anywhere else; they had visited it already many times, they had attended a pontifical Mass; no, there was no doubt about it, St. Peter's was the gem, the centre of Europe, and all the rest, by comparison, was of merely local, provincial interest.

I will confess that knowing my Parsee friend as I thought I did I was not prepared for this outburst. I had always supposed him to be one engrossed in high finance and nothing else; I had read brochures by him, far beyond my understanding, written chiefly for the benefit of government officials at Simla and elsewhere. Now I saw him in a totally new light. Intensely imperial though he was, a devoted subject and servant of the British Empire, yet he was not a European, still less was he an Englishman. In consequence, when he looked on Europe as an intelligent, experienced, even sympathetic outsider, he found its centre, not in London, nor in Paris, nor in Berlin, but in Rome; and the centre of Rome was not the Quirinal nor the Capitol, but St. Peter's and the Vatican. London for business, Paris for life, Berlin for study; but the beating heart of Europe was in Rome.

Such, without a doubt, was this observant and capable Asiatic's conviction; and it is the conviction of many more like him. I would say that it is the conviction of every Asiatic I have met who has lived long in Europe and has had the education and the means to come to a judgment of his own. He may conform to European dress, but that does not make him in the least a European. He may be a loyal British subject, but that does not make him an Englishman. He may begin at Oxford or London; but soon he steps outside the magic circle, and he finds the world larger than any empire; he readjusts his vision and he finds the centre of it all in Rome.

Our conversation did not stop there. Naturally it began to turn upon the place in which we stood. Innocently enough, without any further thought behind my words, I made some obvious remark about the blood that had been shed in that arena, just to gratify the whim of the thousands of spectators seated on the tiers of benches all around. In an instant my friend's face flushed darker, as an Indian's will when he is deeply moved or offended. He stiffened up; he looked into my eyes with a look of defiance. Then he said:

"Bloodshed! Not as much blood was shed in this arena during all the years of its existence as has been shed by Christians in Europe to gratify the whim of Christians!"

I saw at once what he meant. Of course there was a fallacy in the comparison he made, but to point it out would, I knew, be of no use whatever. He was an Asiatic. He looked on Europe from a distance and as a whole, and had little interest in national boundaries or distinctions. He was not a Christian, and therefore by instinct felt himself more akin to the Europe that had once not been Christian. When, then, I made allusion to the wickedness and cruelty of the non-Christian world he took it as a thrust at himself. He was immediately on the defensive. With all our vaunted Christianity, our profession of peace and good will among men, our religion of mercy and charity, we had little to show in practice—so he would have me understand—that commended us to him as better than that which he possessed, or even than the pagans of old.

As I left the Coliseum that day the memory of Li Hung Chang and his criticism, recalled at the beginning of this essay, came back forcibly upon me. It was the same thing

over again. "You Europeans," my Indian financier friend was evidently thinking, "boast to us that you are our superiors. You come amongst us professing to wish to lift us up to your level. But what is your level? Say it is the making of money and we can quite well understand. We can learn that art from you; we can even beat you at it; if money-making makes man great, then we are greater than you, and therefore we have no further use for you."

"But you add that it is not money-making only; it is prosperity and all the other things which money is said to bring, and of which money is said to be the sign. You prove this by building our railways, and levelling our roads, and tunnelling our mountains. You introduce new luxuries into our bazaars; alongside of them you build us your schools. With what result? Our ryots who were once content to stay in their villages, and cultivate their own paddy fields, now flock in hordes into your towns, let loose by your railways, looking for other work which they do not always find, and which when found for the most part degrades them; using every device to slip into your schools that they may pick up a smattering of English; learning to turn into necessities of life luxuries they before had never known or needed; then becoming discontented, ignorant victims of any demagogue, and seeking to defend themselves by means which again have been imported from Europe."

"No, this is not prosperity. Some of us have prospered, that I will allow; because we are cleverer than you, and have known how to use to our advantage the weapons you have put into our hands. On that account, whatever in our hearts we may think of you, we will stand by you, never fear; it pays. But prosperity in general, the Christian prosperity of which you claim to be the harbingers, you still keep that to yourselves. Or rather, unless my observation among you in your own homes deceives me, you have not too much of that commodity for exportation. I look at your cities, your most prosperous cities, and most luxurious; and if what I see there is the kind of thing you wish to give us, we would rather remain as we are, in all our backwardness, and ignorance, and squalid poverty."

"You speak of your Christian charity. You are shocked at our caste system and the cruelty it seems to involve, at our apparent lowering of women, at our neglect of the lives of children. You build hospitals for us and orphanages;

you set us an example in the care of our sick and destitute. Your police, military and civil, keep us in order, and try to prevent us from getting at each other's throats. We recognize all this, and for it we are grateful; in our little way we try to co-operate, chiefly by finding you the money by means of which, it seems, all things to the Christian are possible. Still, when we look at it more closely, almost all this charity is what one may call individual; it is scarcely European in the sense in which you would have us understand the term. It is certainly not the work of your financiers; it is scarcely the work of your governments; it is the work of a few who belong to neither of these classes, who are ignored by the one and patronized by the other. On the whole I am not too sure of your European charity except when it is part of your idea of money-making and prosperity.

"So much of my impression of you close at hand in my own country; when I look at you from a distance I am compelled to be still more suspicious. You speak to us of law and order, and you find it almost impossible to keep law and order at home. You forbid us, quite rightly, to quarrel in our streets or to hit each other on the head before our rival temples; yet at home you seem to extol the massacre of millions as a holy thing, and praise it as a proof of European glory. I know you say something about French and German, ally and alien, and the rest; but what does that mean to me? French and German are not so far apart as Mahometan and Hindu; they have less cause to quarrel; they are, or they profess to be, both alike Christians. Yet when occasion arises they can kill one another with impunity, aided and abetted by the rest of Europe, while you abuse us, and club us, and even shoot us down, if a Mahometan insults a Hindu temple, or a Hindu defiles a Mahometan mosque, and some of us resent it. Christian charity is a puzzle to me.

"Another thing you boast of is your solidarity. You use the word Christian as if at long last you had found the panacea for all evils, the bond that shall make the whole world one. You tell us that this was the ultimate message of the Christ whom you profess to follow, indeed you have made His commission your excuse for interfering with us at all. Yet what do I discover? When you come to us, and ask us to accept this panacea, I find that you are anything but agreed among yourselves as to its ingredients. Some

come and tell us, though it is more an assumption than a doctrine, that to become a Christian one must virtually become an Englishman; at least one must submit to the instruction and formation provided by a certain branch of the English Civil Service. There are others who seem to say that what Christ taught matters very little; we have only to become objects of their philanthropy; let them do us good, as they call it, and it is enough. Others again seem most anxious, not to teach us anything, but to prevent us from learning anything from anyone else. On the whole, we are inclined to say, before you come to teach us your Christianity, we would prefer that you would yourselves agree what Christianity is itself.

"And when I come to Europe I find the confusion still worse confounded. You who boast of your Christian superiority abroad, at home do not seem to mind whether you are Christians or not. You who proclaim the unity of Christendom, spend your time and energies and wealth in keeping up the cleavages of nation against nation, and in creating others. You build up walls shutting out one another; you invent machinery with the avowed object of destroying one another; you develop in different places a Christianity of your own, to suit your own convenience, and proudly call it national; and even that sits so lightly on your shoulders that a man can take of it just as much or as little as he pleases and it matters not. We Indians may be a motley crew, but at least we know where we are. A Hindu is a Hindu, a Mahometan is a Mahometan, and so on; but we do not jumble all together and then say we are a united India. We prefer to build our unity on another basis; we prefer our unity to yours."

Thoughts and comparisons such as these were, I knew, running through my Parsee friend's brain when we parted; I knew it because I had often enough before come across the same in my intercourse with educated Indians. Three vast mistakes we Europeans are liable to make when we form our estimate of the Indian mind and character. The first is to suppose that because we are their rulers therefore they must acknowledge that we are their superiors. They do nothing of the kind; they declare it to be a matter of ships and guns; let them but have rifles in their hands and bayonets at their sides and they would soon show us which are the masters. The second is to make much of our

superior civilization; they retort that their civilization is older than ours by at least a thousand years, and even to-day is more simple, more sound, less artificial. The third is the most serious; it is that which we have attempted here to describe; the Indian looks at its fruits and is merely contemptuous. He will bow before authority; he will be loyal to it so long as it lasts; but he is not deceived by the glitter of magnificence; it is part of his own stock-in-trade. He will accept our education; he knows it is a means to advancement; but he will not allow that European culture is in any way superior to his own. He will respect the name of Christ; he will respect those who profess to teach it; but he is not convinced that the European makes of it in his life as much as he professes.

Sometimes one hears it asked why the Church, or for that matter the Churches, make little or no headway among the upper castes, or the more educated classes, of the Indian continent. Many reasons are given; we are told that their philosophy is deeper than ours, that the caste system binds them down, that missionaries do not sufficiently attempt to influence them but prefer to work among the outcast and poor; we are given many other reasons. In all of these there is much truth. Nevertheless I would venture to say that a greater obstacle than all these is the impression of Christianity made on the minds of seeing Indians by the character of Christians, or so-called Christians, themselves. Born in a creed which is at once his religion, his national distinction, and his inherited civilization,—for the word "Hindu" means all of these, as to a less extent do "Mahometan" and "Parsee"—it is not to be expected that he will lightly set this aside unless he is convinced that he will receive instead something better. He will not cease to be a Hindu that he may join the Church of England; he will not surrender what he has for any sect; he can gain what they have to give him by going to their schools, and, when requisite, putting on a coat and hat. He makes one exception; and this brings us back to my friend in the Coliseum, and his astonishing reverence for St. Peter's.

Among all the varieties of religion presented to him under the name of Christianity the Indian recognizes that there is one which alone is united and consistent. The Catholic missionary has something definite to give; wherever you meet him he has the same doctrine to teach. He is not afraid of

being questioned; he welcomes enquiries and objections. He goes about his work, chiefly teaching and ministering to the poor; he is conspicuous by his poverty, he has no personal ambitions, he is a good friend to anyone who seeks his friendship. All this he sees before his eyes; and when he comes to Europe he is struck by an astounding confirmation. In the schools he has been taught that Europe consists of a number of countries, England, France, Germany, Austria, Italy and the rest, each with its own capital, each with its own government, and that a certain mutual understanding between these make the union of the European people. When he comes here he finds it is very different. He finds that there are really divisions, and sources of cleavage, held together by most artificial bonds; what really makes Europe one is something else, a fellowship of thought and understanding and belief, which permeates the whole continent, is to be found everywhere, gives him the welcome of a fellow-man wherever he comes across it, and the centre of it all is in Rome. At once his perspective is altered; he begins to understand Christianity in quite another way; he goes home realizing that hitherto he has made a great mistake; he has judged Christian Europe by its excrescences, but now he has found its heart. We do not wonder that in this new light St. Peter's, and the Vatican, and the man who resides there, mean to him so much, even though the idea of becoming himself a Christian never once enters his mind.

✠ ALBAN GOODIER.

"THE DEVIL OF MALTHUS"

IN the last week of July the Malthusian League held a banquet in London to celebrate their own jubilee and the 50th anniversary of the trial of Charles Bradlaugh and Mrs. Annie Besant for the publication of a pamphlet on "birth-control." Mr. J. M. Keynes was in the chair and the company included such other energetic publicists as Mr. H. G. Wells and Mr. Harold Cox. The note of victory was in all the speeches, so much so that Mr. Wells thought their work was done and the League might be wound up. *The Nation*, however, commenting on the event in its issue of July 30, said that the victory was not quite complete and there was still some skirmishing to be done "before the reactionaries of the Ministry of Health, the Churches, and the Socialist Party cease from troubling and the reasonable principles for which this League stands are sufficiently established." The calm assumption that they alone are reasonable and that opponents are mere reactionaries is typical of the mentality of the materialists to whom moral principles are at best but rules of expediency or, at worst, irrational "tabus" like those of the savage.

Certainly the Malthusians have cause to congratulate themselves. Not long ago even doctors thought "birth-control" a nasty subject for discussion. To-day it forms the theme of instructions to Girl Guides and, as was stated by a leader of the Girl Guide Movement in Birmingham, girls of fourteen write for pamphlets about it in answer to newspaper advertisements. The number of births in England and Wales fell below the number of deaths during the first quarter of this year and this country's birth rate is now the lowest in Europe with the exception of Sweden. The Registrar-General feels safe in predicting that the birth rate this year will be the lowest on record, lower than in the worst of the war years, when millions of men were away at the front. Mr. Wells was probably shrewder than the writer in *The Nation*. He may foresee that in a very few years the nation will take alarm as the rate of its decline grows more steep, as it infallibly must, unless present tendencies are reversed, and the Malthusian League may find its propaganda made a criminal offence in England as it already is in other countries.

The purpose of this article is not to discuss the morals or the politics of "birth-control," but only certain aspects of economics in relation to population. There is a common impression that the science of Economics gives ground for the fear of the world becoming over-crowded. Mr. Keynes, in his "Economic Consequences of the Peace," told us that the founders of Political Economy had a view of the world which filled them with deep-seated melancholy and, to check more hopeful people, Malthus, said Mr. Keynes, "disclosed a Devil. For half a century all serious economical writings held that Devil in clear prospect. For the next half century he was chained up and out of sight. Now perhaps we have loosed him."

Malthus's Devil was his famous Law of Population. Why was it chained up and kept out of sight after it had frightened generations of economists? Because the economists discovered that the Law was a lie and the Devil was a bogey. The Law of Population stated that population, when unchecked by vice, misery or moral restraint, increases in geometrical ratio, while the means of subsistence increase only in arithmetical ratio. The essence of the Malthusian theory was the comparison of ratios. All the economic experience of the world since Malthus wrote has gone to prove his ratios ridiculous. The increase of subsistence has been nearer geometrical than arithmetical and it has been far higher than the increase of population, even when population has not been checked by vice, misery or moral restraint.

Why did Mr. Keynes say that the Devil of Malthus has been loosed again? Simply because Mr. Keynes had persuaded himself that cereals which had been cheapening throughout the last century began to get slightly dearer between 1900 and 1913. From this he deduced that "a diminishing yield of Nature to man's effort was beginning to reassert itself." These words of Mr. Keynes were enough to fill the minds of lesser economists and journalists with the terror of over-population. If Mr. Keynes had been right in his facts, he might still have been wrong in his deduction. A rise in the price of corn crops could be produced by stronger organization of the agriculturists giving them more bargaining power against the towns. It need not have implied any increased pressure on the soil. But Mr. Keynes was wrong about facts. Cereal crops were getting cheaper, not dearer, in the period 1900-1913. The whole foundation of Mr. Keynes' argument was knocked away by Sir William Beveridge in his

well-known address to the British Association in 1923. In that same address Sir William pulverized all the arguments designed to show that over-population is present or approaching in Great Britain, in Europe or in the world at large. Especially did he demonstrate that the size of our population has nothing whatever to do with our unemployment problem. He remarked very truly that it is important to emphasize that there is no justification for Malthusian panic, because false diagnosis may lead to wrong remedies for the world's sickness to-day.

The address of Sir William Beveridge was masterly as a whole, being a truly scientific analysis based upon an ascertainment and study of actual facts, but it was marked at the end by a pitiful descent into what has been called "Hypothetics," the Science of What Might Possibly Be. Sir William said: "Nothing that I have said discredits the fundamental principle of Malthus, reinforced as it can be by the teachings of modern science. The idea that mankind, while reducing indefinitely the risks to human life, can, without disaster, use to the full a power of reproduction adapted to the periods of savage or pre-human days, can control death by art and leave birth to Nature, is biologically absurd. The rapid cumulative increase following on any practical application of this idea would within measurable time make civilization impossible in this or any other planet."

It was appropriate that Sir William should have extended his theorizing to all the planets; he was perhaps conscious that it has no more practical application to our own than to Saturn. Perhaps he thought he could afford to throw this sop to Mr. Keynes by talking like a geologist of measurable time, after he had demonstrated, as an economist, that the Devil of Malthus was securely chained for the next few centuries.

Another example of speculative trifling was given by Professor J. W. Gregory at the meeting of the British Association in 1924:

From 1906 to 1910, to quote the latter half of the last normal decade, the population of the world grew at the rate of doubling in sixty years. If this rate were to be maintained the 6,600 millions of people, which it has been calculated is the most that the world can feed, would be in existence in 120 years; and even if the food supply were indefinitely multiplied . . . standing room on the earth, exclusive of the remoter Arctic and Antarctic lands, would

be all filled when the population numbered 700 billion (*i.e.*, million million) in the year 3000.

After all, Professor Gregory did not take this calculation seriously. He put it forward, after taking warning from the egregious miscalculations of others such as Gregory King, who, in 1696, calculated that the utmost population that England could support would be 22 million and that that number would not be reached until the year 3500 or 3600. Professor Gregory spoke in 1924. He went back nineteen years to get a "normal" half-decade for his calculation. He would not find many such "normal" periods in the 20th century or any century. He would have been equally entertaining and instructive if he had favoured his audience with a calculation of what the population of the world must have been five thousand years ago on the assumption that the population is halved every sixty years, counting backwards.

Leaving aside his arithmetical exercises in "hypothetics" and speaking in his scientific capacity as a distinguished geographer, Professor Gregory is wholly reassuring in proving that the habitable areas of the earth are, thanks to the advance of science and discovery, vastly greater than they were formerly supposed to be. Not many years ago, it was generally believed that white men could not work and bring up families in the tropics. Professor Gregory takes credit to himself for having, as long ago as 1907, combated this view as a popular prejudice not resting on an adequate foundation. He says:

The evidence to that effect had been stated in a remarkable paper by Dr. L. W. Sambon, and endorsed by the late Sir Patrick Manson, and has been supported by the general trend of medical opinion during the last seventeen years. Thus a leading article in the "Journal of Tropical Medicine" (January 15, 1919, pp. 15-16), proclaims "Disease, not climate, the Enemy. . . . If there is one thing which the study of tropical diseases has shown us, it is that disease, and not the climate, is the cause of this crippling of trade, of the necessity for frequent changes "home" involving expense and the employment of a large permanent staff to fill the gaps caused by sickness, and therefore lessening of profits. The legends, a "bad climate" and "unhealthy climate" are well-nigh expunged from tropical literature. All medical men familiar with the Tropics are cognizant of the fact that disease, and what is more,

preventable disease, is the cause of the bad name associated with any particular region of the Tropics.

After an exhaustive examination of the question of white colonization of the tropics, Professor Gregory concludes that the white man is capable of living and working in any part of Australia, so that this whole continent provides an additional outlet and spacious home for the European race. He does not believe in Asiatic demands or designs upon Australia, for he says there are vast empty spaces in Asia and there are rich lands which can be more easily acquired by Asiatics in the Eastern Archipelago.

From Australia we turn to Africa. *The Round Table* for June, 1927, contains an article entitled "The New Problem of Africa." The article is unsigned, as are all contributions to this periodical, but everything relating to the British Empire that appears in *The Round Table* is most authoritative. The writer says :

The main characteristic of Africa south of the Equator is that nearly the whole country, except the Congo basin and a narrow belt on the east coast, is a plateau averaging some 4,000 feet above the sea. . . . South Africa and much of East-Central Africa, are, from the point of view of colonization, within the temperate zone. This is the first fact to be realized about that vast region, nearly as large as two-thirds of Europe, which may be called the highlands of Africa. The second fact is that the highlands are extraordinarily sparsely settled by the aboriginal races. Though Europe has a population of 450,000,000 the African highlands probably do not contain more than 25,000,000 native inhabitants, and even that population is very unevenly distributed. . . . The white man is colonizing these territories from South Africa right up to the Abyssinian border in increasing numbers ; the nature of the climate, the sparseness of the native population and the high elevation of so much of the country make it possible for him to continue to do so, and whether he will eventually succeed or not, he is making an attempt to create a new land for white settlement in an area two-thirds as large as Europe and stretching from the Equator to the Cape.

We have now heard two most reliable witnesses, and we might have called a hundred authorities of the highest standing, who tell us that both Africa and Australia offer regions of

continental dimensions virtually empty and awaiting colonization by the white man. Similar evidence is given of South America. The leading article of the special Brazil number of *The Times* (June 21, 1927) said:

Few Europeans, even if they are impressed by the geographical immensity of the Brazilian Federation, fully realize the vastness of its potential resources. At present the Union has a population of 35,000,000 though little more than 1 per cent. of its soil has been brought under cultivation, and, without aspiring to the doubtful blessing of a population of Chinese density, Brazil could hold three or four times that population and still remain from the European standpoint a thinly settled country.

Turning to North America, we encounter the fact that geographers are modifying their views of the habitability of the Arctic regions as they have modified them of the Tropics. Mr. V. Stefansson, a Canadian explorer, author of "The Northward Course of Empire," and other important books, declares that there are more than 700 species of flowering plants north of the Arctic Circle and that the polar lands, instead of being wastes of snow, are prevailingly grassy prairie. There are many people living to-day who recall the time when everybody spoke of the Canadian prairie as the Great Desert. Sir William Butler wrote two books on this part of the world with the significant titles, "The Great Lone Land" and "The Wild North Land," which now make utterly comical reading to one who knows Western Canada. Sir William Butler wrote of the winter fierceness, the utter desolation, the treeless waste, the snowdrifts so dense that heaven and earth seemed wrapped together in indistinguishable chaos. The gallant and distinguished author was not romancing: he described what he actually saw, but it happens that the place he described is now the prosperous city of Prince Albert and the Great Desert of Saskatchewan is now reckoned the richest wheat region of the world. Those who know the history of Saskatchewan will not reject as wildly improbable the opinion of Mr. Stefansson that the Arctic prairies may support herds of domestic reindeer and caribou and musk oxen.

It is not always remembered that man makes progress in agriculture as well as in manufactures and mining. Man, by taking thought, breeds a meatier cow, a woollier sheep and a more prolific hen. It may or may not be true that man is

nearing the limit of possible achievement with animals, but it is certain that the applications of science to the breeding of plants and the preservation of crops are only in their infancy. Not many years ago it was considered impossible to grow crops more than a few miles north of Winnipeg because they did not ripen before September when the frost came and killed them. At the present time crops are grown hundreds of miles north and it is hardly possible to fix the territorial limits of land that may be cultivated. This is due to the science of the grain-breeder who produces varieties of grain that ripen in half the time formerly necessary. A variety known as Garnet wheat ripens in 100 days after sowing and there is the utmost confidence among researchers that they will produce a grain to ripen in an even shorter period. An official Canadian Government publication (*Sixty Years of Canadian Progress, 1867-1927*) says :

The breeding of new early-ripening varieties of corn, such as Garnet wheat, is materially increasing the area capable of agricultural development, so that the agricultural possibilities of the lands north of the 60th parallel are as yet practically unknown. Apart from these considerations, it is estimated that out of the 1,401,316,413 acres of the land area of the nine provinces, approximately 358,162,190 acres are available for use in agricultural production, being $2\frac{1}{2}$ times the present occupied area and five times the present improved area of farm lands.

Canada provides us with a striking example of the enormous productivity of the earth. Canada now produces about 400 million bushels of wheat annually, more than a tenth of the wheat consumption of the entire world. There is a population of less than ten millions in Canada and only a fraction of that population is engaged in wheat growing. Canada achieves this result on only one-sixth of the available arable land. She achieves it also without intensive cultivation. The average yield per acre in Canada is 11.4 bushels against 41.4 bushels in Denmark which has the most intensive cultivation of all countries. It is obvious that Canada could easily, if required, grow on her present available land, all the wheat required for the entire world.

It would be forcing an open door to give further evidence that, in the words of Sir William Beveridge, "the limits of agricultural expansion are indefinitely far." The most pessi-

mistic view possible is that we may be nearing the time when further production can only be effected under conditions of decreasing return, that is to say, at a higher average cost. The case for pessimism was argued by an eminent authority, Sir Daniel Hall, in an address to the British Association in 1926 on "The Relation Between Cultivated Area and Population." Sir Daniel begins a very interesting article by trying to estimate the amount of cultivated land that is required to maintain one unit of population, one man, woman or child. In the United Kingdom the produce of 2.5 acres is consumed by one person; in the United States, the ratio is 2.6 acres per person; in France, 2.4 acres; in Spain, 4 acres; in Denmark, 1.82 acres. Putting the various estimates together the conclusion reached is that, under existing conditions of agriculture among the Western peoples, it requires something between 2 and $2\frac{1}{2}$ acres of cultivated land to supply the needs of one unit of population living on the standard of white peoples. The argument drawn from this is that, assuming no improvement in the methods of production and no change in the standard of comfort, we require from 2 to $2\frac{1}{2}$ acres of new land to be brought into cultivation for every new person added to the population. The present annual increment in the white population of the world may be estimated at about five millions. This, taken alone, would necessitate the taking into cultivation of twelve millions of new land every year. "No process of the kind is going on," observes Sir Daniel, "indeed, for many crops there has been an actual shrinkage in the acreage since the war."

The reply to Sir Daniel Hall is obvious. The very fact that the increase of population since the war has not involved the cultivation of new land is the plainest possible proof that his argument applies only to assumed and not to actual conditions. His assumptions are two; that no improvement in the methods of production takes place, and that there is no lowering of the standard of comfort. We have the authority of the recent International Economic Conference held at Geneva for saying that there has been no lowering of the standard of comfort. It therefore follows that there has been an improvement in the methods of production.

Sir Daniel Hall would not dispute the fact of improvement or the possibility, nay, the virtual certainty of further improvement. He is only concerned to warn us that we may not expect improvement to be indefinite. It would be idle to set a

groundless optimism against a groundless pessimism, but Sir Daniel seems to take too narrow a view of the possibilities of improved methods. He does not show appreciation of the fact that improvements in industry and especially in transportation may be as beneficial to agricultural productivity as directly agricultural improvements by drainage, irrigation, fertilizers, pest destruction and so on. Possibly the explanation of this inadvertence is that Sir Daniel is always thinking of the interests of agriculturists as well as of the productivity of the soil, and he is aware that an increase of production, due to such a factor as improved transportation, may be actually prejudicial to the profits of agriculture as a whole.

A word may be said about the lowering of the standard of life that may conceivably be necessitated by pressure of population upon the soil. The lowering need only take the form of making our diet more vegetarian, and of having less potential food converted into alcoholic drink. Britain ferments yearly the equivalent of one and a half million acres of barley. France devotes four million acres to vineyards. Sir Daniel Hall recalls Maitland's remark that, even in the time of the Domesday Book, about one-third of the arable land of England was devoted to beer!

All flesh is grass. Before man can eat beef the cow must have consumed vegetable produce many times greater than its own food value. Sir Daniel Hall says:

The great areas of grassland have a lower output of energy than the cultivated land, and the conversion of vegetable into animal food, whether of natural or cultivated fodder crops, is always attended by a great waste of energy. In the most economic production of pig-meat or milk the energy recovered is only about one-sixth of that consumed, and this represents the machine at the top of its efficiency. The longer period of beef production results in a recovery as beef of only one-eighteenth of the energy consumed, and in practice the actual wastage of fodder and feeding stuffs doubles or trebles the inevitable losses by conversion.

It is evident that in the remote and unlikely event of mankind finding food harder to obtain the available supplies can be considerably economized by less meat-eating and less consumption of alcoholic drinks, a "lowering" of the standard of comfort for which mankind might be little the worse!

I have mentioned that there has been an improved standard

of comfort since the war. In proof I quote the Final Report of the World Economic Conference held at Geneva, May, 1927.

The documentation prepared by the Secretariat under the direction of the Preparatory Committee . . . presents a picture of the economic condition of the world with a fullness and authority which has probably never hitherto been attained. . . . The figures show that, whereas in 1925 the world's population was about 5 per cent. greater than in 1913, production of foodstuffs (excluding China) and of raw materials was from 16 to 18 per cent. greater. . . . These statistics refer to the world as a whole. They do not represent the position of each continent. While certain parts of the world have progressed considerably more than these average figures indicate, there are other continents, notably Europe, which are far behind. The production of Europe, whose population has increased by 1 per cent., was in 1925 about 5 per cent. greater than in 1913.

The slower rate of progress in Europe has been due, of course, to the economic dislocation produced by the war and by the peace treaties. It is true that individual countries have their population problems, giving rise to political problems, but an economist looking at the world, and considering only actual, not hypothetical conditions, must say that there is no ground whatever for Malthusian fears. The increase of the means of subsistence everywhere outpaces the increase of population. The Devil of Malthus is securely chained.

H. SOMERVILLE.

AGOSTINO GEMELLI

IN the late autumn of the year 1903 members of the medical profession in Milan were startled by a most sensational piece of news, to wit, that Dr. Edoardo Gemelli, one of the most brilliant and promising young doctors in the town, a violent socialist in politics, had deliberately turned his back on his family, on his profession and on his friends, in order to enter as a novice a Franciscan monastery near Brescia.

Dr. Edoardo Gemelli—a Franciscan? The amazing announcement was treated at first almost in the light of a practical joke. But as the blank surprise gave place to an uncomfortable feeling of doubt, which in its turn soon developed into definite and certain knowledge, the matter was treated in a vastly different spirit. No stone was left unturned in order to induce the young doctor to go back on his "mad decision." So convinced was his father, an old soldier of Garibaldi, that his brain had been affected by the disastrous effects of mental strain and overwork, that, in a vain endeavour to persuade him to come home, and acting on the advice of friends, he actually appeared at the monastery one day accompanied by a mental specialist of repute from a private lunatic asylum. It was in this manner that the outside world took the news of the conversion of Dr. Edoardo Gemelli.

Edoardo Gemelli—Father Agostino Gemelli in religion—the founder and present rector of the Catholic University of the Sacred Heart in Milan, was born in that city in 1878, and came of a family of well-to-do Lombard peasant proprietors, Italian patriots of the old school who considered it quite sufficient to follow the natural virtues without concerning themselves much about religion.

In 1896 Gemelli entered the university of Pavia as a medical student. The atmosphere of an Italian state university was, for political reasons, at that time anything but Catholic. Many of the professors were anti-clericals—some, indeed, apostates from the Faith. At Pavia an ex-priest, Ausonio Franchi, held the chair of Philosophy; at Padua an ex-canon of the cathedral of Mantua, Roberto Ardigò, occupied the same government post. Positivism and

Materialism were the main ingredients of the intellectual atmosphere: facts, plain, ascertainable facts, not obsolete metaphysical theories, were alone presented. Science—with a capital S—was to do away with the antiquated notion of a personal God, to provide a panacea for all the ills of society and ultimately solve the great riddle of the Universe.

"Dazzled, bewildered by the marvellous scientific discoveries of the age, those of us"—to quote Gemelli's own words—"whose university career passed between 1885 and 1900 all believed for a moment that Science would be able to furnish an answer to every question which perplexed our minds."

In 1902 Gemelli took a brilliant degree in medicine and surgery. He continued afterwards to do research work under the nerve specialist Golgi of Pavia, a man of pronounced materialistic views.

How came it that, brought up in such distinctly non-Christian surroundings, he felt drawn nevertheless towards the religious life?

The immediate and external cause of his conversion may be traced to the influence of a young Milanese lawyer, Giandomenico Pini, who had but lately left the bar in order to become a priest and was employed at that time on the staff of the Ambrosian Library in Milan. Heated and eager discussions took place from time to time in the Library reading-room between the young priest and the socialist doctor, and were prolonged, as a matter of fact, at intervals throughout a whole summer—much to the annoyance and disgust of the students, who more than once petitioned the Head of the Library, Mgr. Achille Ratti, now H.H. Pius XI., to request the two to be silent.

In the end the socialist doctor laid down his arms and acknowledged defeat. The lawyer-priest had not only won one of his hardest cases, but incidentally had also discovered that, rather than that of a student, his real vocation lay in the line of active work amongst young men. Mgr. Pini has since become well-known throughout the length and breadth of Italy for his apostolic labours amongst university students, of whose Catholic Associations he is now the ecclesiastical head.

Of the intellectual path along which Gemelli's mind travelled in its journey towards faith he has since had occasion to speak more than once.

The reign of Positivism and Materialism in Italian university life did not outlast the end of the last century. In the opening years of the twentieth century Papini—the future convert and author of the famous "Life of Christ"—was one of the first to open the attack on the old false idols of atheistic philosophic thought in a series of violent articles which appeared in the pages of his monthly magazine "La Voce." Shortly after, Benedetto Croce started in Naples, with the help of Gentile, his important philosophical review "La Critica" with similar intent. It seemed as though the death-knell of Materialism had struck at last. Idealism was hailed as a substitute for Positivism: Comte and his followers were swept aside: Hegel was to reign in their stead.

"If"—to quote Gemelli once again—"I, like so many others, was able to free myself from the shackles of Positivism, this was due to the violent, but always incisive, criticism of Positivism made at that time by the young Italian idealists."

Deluded by Science, for she had proved herself incapable of fulfilling all her promises, he now sought in the works of contemporary philosophers that which Science had been unable to give him, namely, a satisfactory answer to the riddle of life. But here, alas! a fresh delusion lay in store for him. Far from offering a satisfactory solution, contemporary philosophy only rendered each problem a thousand times more complicated.

In despair he then turned as a last vain hope towards Christianity. It was at this juncture that his friend and Catholic colleague, Dr. Necchi—at the present moment a fellow worker with Gemelli on the staff of the University of the Sacred Heart in Milan—put him in touch with Pini.

Once having firmly grasped the fundamental truth of Christianity he quickly realized the necessity of so adapting his conduct as to bring it into harmony with the idea which was henceforth to be the guiding principle of his life. Hence the Franciscan vocation which so alarmed and astonished relatives and friends.

On November 23, 1903, he assumed the brown Franciscan habit; on November 23, 1907, he made his solemn profession—he had already been ordained to the priesthood during the previous March.

In order to continue his research work and thereby increase his knowledge of medical science and kindred sub-

jects, Gemelli visited between 1907 and 1911 most of the more important universities of northern Europe—those of Bonn, Frankfort, Munich, Cologne, Vienna, Louvain, Amsterdam, and the Catholic Faculty of Paris.

In 1911 he took a degree of doctor in Philosophy at Louvain: in 1914 he accepted the appointment of the Italian Government to the post of teacher of Experimental Psychology at the University of Turin, refusing almost at the same time the offer of the chair of Psychology at the Japanese University of Tokyo.

He had been instrumental in the meantime in starting several important and influential Catholic magazines in Italy.

In 1909 appeared the first number of the "*Rivista di Filosofia Neoscolastica*," followed in 1914 by "*Vita e Pensiero*."

The entry of Italy in 1915 into the Great War did not bring about the suspension of these publications. On the contrary, during the anxious and terrible years ensuing they rather increased in size and importance. When peace was finally declared Gemelli was in a position to start two others, the "*Rivista del Clero Italiano*" and "*Fiamma Viva*," the organ of the Italian Catholic Young Women's Associations.

During the war Gemelli was a military chaplain at the General Headquarters of the Italian Army, and it was largely owing to his energy and personal initiative that in 1917—on the first Friday of the first month in the year—the whole Italian Army was officially consecrated to the Sacred Heart. Nearly two million communicants approached the temporary altars erected in the trenches and behind the lines on that occasion.

The most lasting title to fame, the achievement which ranks highest in the immense debt of gratitude owed to him by the Catholic population of Italy is, however, the foundation of a Catholic University, with full recognition, right in the heart of Milan, the centre of Italian commerce and industrial life.

The story of the foundation of the Catholic University of Milan has often been told, and it is not our purpose to retell it. The idea was no new one. The merit of Gemelli lies in having put it into execution. He had pledged his word to a dying man. A promise of that kind is seldom broken.

In the autumn of 1917 Gemelli was present amongst those

who stood round the deathbed of the late Professor Toniolo of Pisa, one of the most conspicuous and universally respected figures in the story of Catholic Action in Italy during the last fifty years. "I shall not see the end of the war," murmured the old professor sadly, "but you, as soon as it is over, start the Catholic University; get it going!" Gemelli promised. From that moment the creation of a future Catholic University became a certainty.

In October, 1919, the enterprising Franciscan set his hand to the great task which lay before him. From Benedict XV. he received every encouragement. "Fate una cosa grandiosa!" urged the Pope in a memorable private audience.

A year later, in October, 1920, another great champion of Catholicity in Italy lay at the point of death. Almost with his last breath Cardinal Ferrari, Archbishop of Milan, urged Gemelli to carry quickly to conclusion the work already begun. A victim of a most painful form of cancer in the throat which deprived him before the end of all power of speech, in the midst of acute physical suffering, the Cardinal still found time to pen an earnestly worded message to the faithful of his diocese asking them to give this great initiative their most hearty and sincere co-operation.

In December, 1921, the Catholic University was formally opened by Cardinal Achille Ratti, then Archbishop of Milan, but destined soon after to be raised to the Chair of St. Peter.

In the quiet solitude of the Franciscan monastery in which he had first found shelter Agostino Gemelli had formed a firm resolution. Come what might he would devote all his energies to preventing the souls of other young men passing through that tragic phase of agnosticism through which he himself, through ignorance of the first elements of Christian doctrine, had passed as a university student.

They at least, in so far as he could prevent it, should never know what it was not to love God because they had been taught that He no longer existed.

Effectively had he kept his word.

H. B. L. HUGHES.

ELIZABETHAN "CONTINUITY"

I. BISHOP TUNSTALL'S CONFESSION OF THE FAITH.

IT is clear that Elizabeth and her advisers had cherished great hopes that the venerable Bishop of Durham, who had bent so miserably beneath the storm in Henry's reign, might be won over to a new and final apostasy, although no sign of his former pliancy had appeared since he recovered himself in the days of Edward VI. The oldest survivor of the hierarchy, Cuthbert Tunstall had been a bishop before the gospel light first dawned from Boleyn's eyes; he had been intimate with the great men of the generation that was ending at Elizabeth's birth; his name was honoured as a scholar, the friend of Erasmus, the friend of Fisher and More.

Writing to Parker on October 5, 1559, Cecil says: "My good Lord,—the Queen's Majesty is very sorry that ye can prevail no more with Mr. Tunstall, and so am I, I assure you; for the recovery of such a man would have furthered the common affairs of this realm very much." On August 19th, Tunstall himself had written, in identical words, to Cecil and to Sir Thomas Parry, Treasurer of the Queen's Household, in view of an impending visitation: "if the same visitation shall proceed to make end in my Diocese of Durham as I do plainly see to be set forth here in London, as pulling down of altars, defacing of churches by taking away of the crucifixes, I cannot in my conscience consent to it, being pastor there: because I cannot myself agree to be a Sacramentary, nor to have any new doctrine taught in my Diocese. . . . my conscience will not suffer me to receive and allow any doctrine in my Diocese other than Catholic; as knoweth Almighty Jesu, who ever preserve your mastership to His pleasure and yours."¹

Strenuous efforts have been made, in behalf of "continuity" to evade these very plain facts, notably in a book upon which many have relied to shelter them from misgivings, Dr. Frere's "History of the English Church, 1558—1625." "Bishop Tunstall . . . came up to London . . . on July 20, 1559, and was shocked by what he saw there.

¹ In Fr. G. E. Phillips, "The Extinction of the Ancient Hierarchy," p. 174.

He was no favourer of the papacy, as his past history had showed; he had defended Henry's action on the ground that it involved no change of faith; he had gone as far as he could with doctrinal reform under Edward, until he saw it lead* to iconoclasm and sacrilege; and now history was repeating itself. He seems to have been prepared to accept both supremacy and service-book; but he protested that he could not in conscience consent to the pulling down of altars and defacing of churches in his diocese, nor could he himself become a sacramentary or approve of the teaching of new doctrine" (iii. 45). This is a good example of the way in which history is manipulated into a soporific for Anglicans troubled by the Catholic claims. "His past history *had* showed"—from 1534 to at latest 1551—that he had renounced the Pope, like most others, through terror. Dr. Frere does not tell his readers that Tunstall's *last eight years* had been those of an undoubted "favourer of the papacy"!¹ Dr. Frere might just as well say that St. Peter's fall showed that he was no favourer of Christianity! Within three months of Tunstall's release from prison at the beginning of Mary's reign there appeared a tract—a pirated edition of Bishop Gardiner's "De Vera Obedientia," edited with a preface by "Michal Wood" (believed to have been Bale), ostensibly printed in "Roane" (Rouen); a second edition one month later coolly purported to be "printed eftsones, in Rome, before the castle of S. Angel, at the signe of S. Peter." In the preface ("Roane" edition) we read of "a certaine Sermon made in English, . . . about .xiii. yeres past, by D, Tonstal B. of Duresme, and set furthe in print by like for his owne glorye, or rather purgation, beyng suspected² to be a fauourer of the pretended autoritie, Antichristian power and detestable enormities of the B. of Rome whereof he semeth at this daye to be bent with other his complices (that Sermon notwithstanding) not onely to be no hinderour, but also frindelye fauourer, a trustie proctour, and an open defendour, much to be lamented, in respect of his excellent gifts, and vertues otherwise."³ Now Tunstall did *not* wait till "popery came in fashion" to confess his

¹ For further evidence see Fr. G. E. Phillips, "Extinction of the Ancient Hierarchy," ch. x., esp. 187—194.

² The "Rome" edition adds "and not without cause."

³ S. R. Maitland, "Essays on Subjects connected with the Reformation in England," xvii. 367—8; whence also I have taken the quotations from the "Roane" tract.

allegiance to the Holy See. The Anglican historian Fuller says expressly "in the reign of king Henry the Eighth he publicly confuted the Papal Supremacy. . . And yet (man is but man) he returned to his error *in the reign of King Edward the Sixth, continuing therein in the first of Queen Elizabeth, for which he was deprived of his Bishopric*" ("Worthies of England," iii. 409, apud Phillips: "Extinction of the Ancient Hierarchy," 160). Again, if history was repeating itself in iconoclasm and sacrilege, surely all good men were bound to resist such a revolution, and yet we find Dr. Frere branding those who did resist it as "a small and diminishing knot of men determined to resist reform to the last" (*ut supra* ii. 29). In saying Tunstall "seems to have been prepared to accept both supremacy and service-book," our "Anglo-Catholic" historian is either drawing upon private sources of information, which in the public interest should be made known, or else he is guilty of a very grave slander against a saintly confessor of the Faith. By such means are souls of good will defrauded of their true home, the *one* ark of salvation, and I do not envy the wishy-washy "charity" that feels no indignation thereat.

The witness of such a man's successor, regarding continuity of faith and orders, can hardly fail to be of interest today; and that testimony, whatever else we may think of it, is so clear and emphatic as to need careful hiding from the dupes of fables now in fashion. The surprising intervention of Pilkington's present successor in 1924, in favour of that claim to continuity which Pilkington has done so much to discredit, enhances the value of the latter's testimony.

James, the third son of Richard Pilkington, was born at Rivington in the Lancashire parish of Bolton-le-Moors in 1520. Educated as a sizar at St. John's College, Cambridge, he proceeded Bachelor of Arts in 1539 and was elected Fellow in the same year, becoming M.A. in 1542 and B.D. in 1550. He argued against Transubstantiation before the Royal visitors at Cambridge in June, 1549, and in 1550 received the vicarage of Kendal,¹ which he resigned in 1551. In 1554 he retired to the Continent, living at Zurich, Basel and Geneva. In the Frankfort disputes he favoured the cause of the Edwardine Liturgy. On Elizabeth's accession he returned and sat on the commission, appointed by pro-

¹ The Rev. F. O. White in his "Lives of the Elizabethan Bishops" (1898), p. 164 says Kirby in Kendal.

clamation in December, 1558, for the revision of the Book of Common Prayer. In 1559 he was one of the commissioners for visiting Cambridge and Eton, and on July 20th was admitted, irregularly, as Master of St. John's College and made Regius Professor of Divinity at Cambridge, Bullock, the Catholic Master, being "put out," according to Fuller. In 1560 he preached at the re-interment of Bucer and Phagius at Cambridge before the University, published his "Exposition of the Prophecy of Aggeus" (of which a new edition appeared in 1562), married Alicia daughter of Sir John Kingsmill, and was appointed Bishop, after the new order, of Winchester, but in 1561 was transferred to Durham, "of which," his editor says with old-fashioned candour, "he was the first protestant bishop," the royal assent being dated February 20, 1561. In October he resigned his mastership and professorship, to be succeeded in both by his brother Leonard. About the same time another brother, John, was made archdeacon, and in 1565 he collated his youngest brother Laurence to the vicarage of Norham. In June, 1561, he preached a sermon at St. Paul's Cross, after the destruction of the cathedral spire by lightning, which called forth a vigorous comment by Morwen, Bishop Bonner's chaplain, issued of course anonymously and widely distributed, to which Pilkington replied in the only one of his writings still read. In 1566 he founded a free grammar school at Rivington. Upon the Northern Rising in 1569, less courageous than his neighbour prelate, Best of Carlisle (who was equally unsuccessful in perverting a Catholic population), he fled with his family, but afterwards claimed the enormous forfeitures, only to find that the prudent Government had taken over by a special Act wealth too great for a subject to receive. Pilkington died at Bishop Auckland on January 23, 1575, leaving a wife and two daughters, his sons having died young. In his will, dated February 4, 1571, his special abhorrence of Catholic burial rites finds final expression, "to be buried with as few popish ceremonies as may be, or vain cost" (Wks. Introd. p. xi.). His executors solved the difficulty by burying him without any ceremonies at all; but a few months later it was deemed best to re-inter him in the desecrated cathedral, where his admirers added an epitaph after their kind.

Of his character there is little need to speak; it is self-pictured in his writings. Perhaps the best we can say is

that he was less servile to the Crown than many; on the other hand it was only when material possessions were at stake that he braved its displeasure. Indeed, that avarice of which he was ever accusing the stripped and hunted "papists" might almost seem to have been his ruling passion. Elizabeth, herself well versed in that art, had noticed his acquisitiveness. His writings, however, rather depict a man whose chief joy was to revile with studied blasphemy all that his fathers and his neighbours held ineffably sacred. To any who may deem this strong language I recommend a perusal of those writings, edited by the Rev. James Scholefield, A.M., Regius Professor of Greek at Cambridge, and published by the Parker Society in 1842. Their value to-day consists in the very direct lie they give (I make no apology for the word) to the fashionable fiction of continuity. Pilkington and his fellows did not in the least resemble Erasmus and Colet; they strongly remind us of Lenin and Calles, with whom lies their true affinity. Some day this plain fact will emerge, and then things will happen little to the liking of the *Church Times*. Meanwhile it is an urgent duty to discredit the comfortable legends in vogue amongst "Anglo-Catholics" and High Anglicans.

II.—BISHOP PILKINGTON'S DENIAL OF THE PRIESTHOOD.

One passage has long been familiar to Catholic students of those times, for its frank giving away of the whole Anglican case as put forward since the rise of Laud. It was first tentatively adumbrated by Bancroft in February, 1588, in a sermon which suggested the divine right of bishops in the Church of England, a doctrine, in the words of an able and candid Anglican historian, "at the time entirely novel . . . a desertion of the ground hitherto held by Jewell, Whitgift, and Hooker, and [which] appeared to have been enunciated simply, as one may say, in order to overtrump Cartwright's trick," and shortly afterwards supported by Bilson,¹ whose "theory of Episcopacy, however, was far too thoroughgoing, not only for Jewel and Whitgift before him, but for Andrewes afterwards."²

¹ G. W. Child, "Church and State under the Tudors," pp. 237-8.

² *Ibid.* p. 239 (note). Again "those opinions . . . were totally unknown before, and remained almost entirely inoperative for many years after," p. 280. Also "Whitgift is looked upon justly as the great enemy . . . of the Puritans. Yet Whitgift was as extreme a Protestant as any who was ever made a bishop, and not only an extreme Protestant, but an extreme Calvinist," p. 228. No better book could be recommended to Anglicans open to conviction than this work by one of themselves.

In "The Burning of St. Paul's," his answer to Morwen, Pilkington declares: "What religion the old bishops have been of from the beginning in these sees which he names, or how they were made, I think no good record declares. The rudeness of the times have been such, and such destruction of old monuments, both by inward and outward war, that none or few remain. I will note only therefore such things as were done in our days, that every man knows, or else such as be in print. In Duresme I grant the bishop that now is [that is, himself, Pilkington] and his predecessor [viz., Bishop Tunstall] *were not of one religion in divers points, nor made bishops after one fashion.* This hath neither cruche nor mitre, never sware against his prince his allegiance to the pope: this has neither power to christen bells, *nor hallow chalices and superaltars, &c., as the other had; and with gladness praises God, that keeps him from such filthiness:*" (p. 586; italics mine). Could anything be more explicit, more flatly contradictory of the fairy-tales in which modern Anglicans live and move and have their being? The reference to the Edwardine Ordinal is significant. Pilkington continues: "His predecessor wrote, preached, and sware against the pope, was justly deprived afterwards for disobedience to his prince; and yet, being restored, submitted himself to the pope again., Stout Stephen and bloody Bonner, with other champions yet living, be in the like case. *God defend all good people from such religion and such bishops!*" (*Ibid.* pp. 586-7). Pilkington, then, declares Tunstall to have been as much a "favourer of the papacy" as the still living Bonner, but Dr. Frere, 343 years later, knows better, and insists upon making Pilkington and even Coverdale (of all men!) *Catholic bishops* in their own despite, a class for whom Pilkington's own elegant name is "horned cattle of the pope" (p. 604); mitres not being then in fashion with the Protestants. On p. 531 this "first six centuries" man refers to the Six Articles of 1540 as "the six-stringed whip."

A few pages before, Pilkington had given a more detailed and comprehensive denial to the sacrament of Order, an utterance typical of contemporary Anglican bishops, but unsuspected by those who keep their eyes glued to the *Church Times*, and therefore deserving to be quoted in full. "In those places of the scripture afore rehearsed, there be these things to be noted, in sending forth ministers. First, an

assembly of the clergy and people, to bear testimony of their honesty and aptness that be called: for it must not be done in corners, lest such be admitted as be unworthy, and with whom some could or would have found fault, if it had been known and done openly. The ministry is so godly a vocation, that none ought to be admitted to it having any notable fault in them, or if they may not abide the trial and judgment of the multitude, yea, though they be heathens. For St. Paul says, they must have good testimony of their honesty even 'of them that be out of the church.' Secondly I note they used exhortations, with fasting, prayer, and laying on of hands. *These ceremonies* we be sure are good and godly, because the apostles used them so oft: and these, except some great cause to the contrary, are to be used of all in calling of the ministers. All these things the order now appointed observes, and no more: all the popish ceremonies be cut off as vain and superfluous. The time of giving orders now is the holy day, when the people be assembled, that they may see who be called: and if they know any notable fault in any of them that are there to be appointed ministers or bishops, they may declare it, that they may be rejected as unworthy. The popish prelates give their orders on the Saturday, when the people is not present, and commonly at home in their chapels, where few resort to see. The bishops now use in giving their orders an exhortation, common prayer, the communion, and laying on of hands, which the apostles used. The pope and his prelates *have devised of themselves* clippings, shaving their crowns, an unlawful compelled vow to live unmarried, *oil for anointing their fingers*, and *power to sacrifice for quick and dead*, their double Latin matins and even-song daily, with such a kind of apparel that they be more like to Aaron and Moses, priests of the old law, than a simple preacher of Christ's gospel, a minister of his sacraments of the new testament" (pp. 580-1). Here again the modern pretence of continuity finds the flattest of repudiations. If Anglicans were to read for themselves the plain testimony of their own founders, then, surely, to apply a happy phrase of the late Professor Phillimore, "many cats would be let out of many bags, and the constitution would be in grave danger."

I would, however, invite the serious attention of any open to conviction who may happen to see this paper to a further

passage in which Tunstall's successor sets forth his belief, or rather total lack of belief, in holy order, the powers and functions of the priesthood, blessings and consecrations generally, and if they find the matter of interest I would urgently invite them to follow up their investigation of the *actual* teaching and conduct of *all* Elizabeth's prelates, and more especially those who took part in the changes of 1559—observe I am not asking them to take my word for anything beyond what I make good by evidence here cited—and to compare their findings carefully with Dr. Frere's "History." If they are men of good will I am in no doubt about their verdict; they will not only understand but share my indignation, and confess that what Dr. Frere has thought necessary to omit is in truth the whole story.

In his "Aggeus" our worthy author thus delivers himself about holy water:—...how can the pope's conjured water, which he calls holy, make the man or house where it is sprinkled so holy, that no devils dare enter? The devil durst tempt our Saviour Christ; and yet they say he fears their conjured water as though it were holier than Christ Himself. Where hath he any promise from God of such foolishness? What can their holy ashes, holy palms, holy crosses, holy bells, holy cream, relics, moulds, chalices, corporas, fire, candles, beads, or that which is their most holy relic, their oil, where-with they anoint their shavelings, priests, and bishops, do? They would make men believe that the oil hath such holiness in it, that whosoever wanteth it is no priest nor minister. *Therefore in the late days of popery our holy bishops called before them all such as were made ministers without such greasing, and blessed them with the pope's blessing, anointed them, and then all was perfect; they might sacrifice for quick and dead: but not marry in no case, and yet keep whores as many as they would.*" It is hateful to have to quote such beastly ribaldry, but those who systematically falsify history leave me no choice. The new prelates, as my friend Mr. Clayton has pointed out, had a fanatical hatred of the angelic virtue,¹ and, as is the manner of such, wantonly supposed that none observed it in practice, measuring others by themselves, and adding to their broken vows and sacrilegious unions the vilest slanders against those who had not apostatized alike from faith, obedience, and continence. I

¹ "The Historic Basis of Anglicanism," 1925, pp. 16—18.

may also invite attention to the buffoon sophistry of the words that conclude the passage: "If any of their such greased disciples were traitor, felon, or heretic, that he had deserved death (in token that their oil was so holy, and had entered so deeply into the flesh, but bringing no holiness with it; for then their anointed should not have fallen so sore as they did, and do); before any such offender could suffer death, he must first be deposed of all that he received from the pope of his orders and apparel, and have all that skin of his crown and fingers pared off or scraped, because they were greased with their oil" (pp. 162-3).¹

Is it too much to assume that Pilkington and his fellow participators are surer authorities as to what was intended and accomplished by the revolutionaries of 1559 than those who read them backwards or suppress their emphatic testimony three and a half centuries later? At all events Jewel himself, the authorized theologian of Elizabeth's church, was equally unconscious of a continuity which he repudiated in advance with equal vigour. "This only will I speak," he writes, "and that in a word: they which brought in transubstantiation, masses, calling upon saints, sole life, purgatory, images, vows, trifles, follies, babbles, into the church of God, have delivered new things, and which the scriptures never heard of. Whatsoever they cry or crack, they bring not a jot out of the word of God" (Wks., Parker Soc., Vol. II., pp. 959-60).¹ And this is the man who challenged appeal to the first six centuries, the man whom Dr. Frere is pleased to describe as "committed only to such assertions of Catholic truth as could be justified by reference to the double standard of the Scriptures and the doctrine of the primitive Church, as expressed by authoritative councils and the consent of the Fathers."² I fear we shall have to wait long enough for an explanation how Jewel's (and his colleagues') comprehensive denials—much resembling those of certain Protestant prelates to-day—can conceivably be reconciled with the Scriptures, the doctrine of the primitive Church, authoritative councils, or the consent of the Fathers.

H. E. G. ROPE.

¹ Jewel indulges in similar ribaldry about holy oil in his "Treatise on the Sacraments," Wks. Parker Soc., p. 1136.

² "History of the English Church, 1558-1625," 1904, p. 86.

THE MISSIONARY PROBLEM OF "CASTE"

THEORETICALLY, the Hindu religion, being professedly not a revelation but a search for truth, treats all other creeds with tolerance. Mr. D. S. Sarma, M.A., a learned Brahmin, a Professor in the Madras Presidency College, writes as follows in his "Primer of Hinduism": "We look upon the whole world as a joint family; with open arms we welcome Muslims, Christians, Parsees and Jews, as our brethren." But practice gives the lie to this open-mindedness: at the entrance of the great Hindu temples—as, for example, Srirangam, near Trichinopoly—there is a notice, printed in large characters, to the effect that Mahomedans, Christians, Pariahs and dogs are not admitted within the sacred precincts. Stranger still, if a Hindu, dissatisfied with the misty philosophy and the futile fables of Hinduism, accepts Christian baptism, he is instantly treated as a polluted being whose very contact is to be shunned, who is no more allowed to eat with his Hindu "brethren," who, if he live in the Native States where Hinduism is still supreme, loses all right to his ancestral property and is subjected to such persecution as to make death itself a welcome guest. Judging, then, from facts, this liberalism of the modern Hindu exists only as a theory; and it exists with a fierce detestation of the unique religion of Christ. More than thirty years ago the great Hindu, Swami Vivekananda, said: "We Hindus not only tolerate but accept every religion: praying at the Mosque of the Mahomedans, worshipping before the fire of the Zoroastrians, and kneeling before the Cross of the Christian . . . We gather all these flowers and bind them with the twine of love, making a wonderful bouquet of worship." So far so good, but if one ventures to point out that, as truth is one, so religion must be one, the Swami shows how thin his tolerance is. "If anyone," says he, "dreams of the exclusive survival of his own religion or church, and the destruction of the others, I pity him from the bottom of my heart." The pity of the Swami is not far removed from contempt, and many of his modern followers, though admiring Christ, and even admitting His divinity, choose from His doctrine just what suits them, and reject what disturbs their peace. To say, for instance, that Christ is the only mediator between God and

man, that none can reach Heaven except through Him, that one must believe and be baptized in order to be saved, is, in the eyes of the modern Hindu, "a pretention which, always idle, is now a grievous anachronism. . . . A narrow mind and a cramped heart can no longer be considered as essential to the true religion."¹

From this glimpse of the mentality of the modern Hindu we may readily see that his conversion is a problem indeed. The solution of this problem will be discussed under two headings :—

- (1) How to reach the modern Hindu ?
- (2) How to convince and convert him ?

(1) Before being convinced and converted the modern Hindu must be reached, and this difficulty takes precedence for more reasons than one. Apart from the mass conversions under the auspices of the Catholic Portuguese Government in the 16th century, and excepting, as not parallel, those among the non-Hindu aborigines of Chota Nagpur in our own day, the progress of conversion among caste Hindus has always been slow. The question of merely approaching them to obtain a hearing has been the object of anxious solicitude to generations of missionaries since the time of Father De Nobili and Blessed John de Britto. These valiant missionaries, and many after them, tried to solve the problem by becoming Indians, by adopting Indian dress and customs, and living like the Indian "sanniasy" (religious teacher). They converted several thousand caste Indians, and their method might have finally succeeded, but the advent of Dutch and English Protestant missionaries during the 18th century stopped the movement.

The foreign nationality of the Catholic missionaries was the first obstacle ; race and religion are often vitally intermingled, and the Hindus began to include in the contempt with which they regarded the *Pranguis* and *Mlechas* (impure foreigners), their native converts. This racial feeling is the reason why our holy religion, in most parts of India, is actually regarded by the Hindu as the religion of foreigners or of outcasts, of men, indeed, with whom no respectable Hindu can mix in social intercourse. This fact alone forms an almost insurmountable obstacle to the conversion of India, for Hindus of high or middle class, and even those of the lower classes,

¹ *The Hindu* (a great Madras daily.)

really shudder at the thought of joining a religion involving the loss of social rank and respectability, a religion which would lower them so much in the esteem of their fellow countrymen. The certainty of being abandoned, if not more bitterly persecuted, by their relatives and friends, the certainty, in most cases, of entire loss of property and future prospects, is a terrible deterrent to even a consideration of the claims of the Catholic Church.

The resulting devotion of the missionary to those who are approachable—to the poor, the despised, the pariahs and outcasts, although a strict fulfilment of their Master's words: "The poor have the Gospel preached to them,"—has unfortunately this repercussion that the breach is widened between the Christian and the caste Hindu. To be baptized, to join in worship with low-caste people in what they call the "Pariah" church, seems to the latter utterly unthinkable.

(2) Enough has been said on the difficulty of reaching the modern Hindu to show what sort of success has attended the missionaries' efforts to convince him. It was thought by some missionaries that courses of Catholic Philosophy and Theology, given in a manner warranted to attract the popular taste, or public lectures on Catholic topics, would attract educated Hindus, and these were attempted on several occasions both in Colleges and in Public Halls. The writer remembers several attempts, carefully prepared by competent men, which proved utter failures. As soon as the speaker, in the third or fourth lecture, began to treat of subjects concerning salvation and the soul's future destiny, the Hindus kept away. Once the hall was emptied before the lecturer's very eyes, a polite intimation that Hindus do not want to hear of such things. On another occasion, when a famous convert from the North (Mr. Upadhyaya Brahmabandhav) was speaking of the glories of Mother India to a large audience in the Town Hall of Trichinopoly, the Hindus listened with rapt attention, and went into ecstasies of applause. During his second lecture, on the Finite and Infinite, in which he indirectly attacked the pantheistic theories of some Hindu philosophers, one of his hearers rudely interrupted and contradicted him. His third lecture was broken up by Hindus who could not bear to hear a Hindu "renegade" talk disparagingly of the philosophers of Mother India. Similarly, when, quite lately, a Protestant came to lecture on Christ, the lecture hall became a pandemonium.

Another method, more practical and successful, when possible, is that of *private conversation*. This was the method of Father Billard, S.J., who, some thirty years ago, when Professor of English in St. Joseph's College, Trichinopoly, was able by this means to enlighten and convert the few Brahmin young men who formed the nucleus of the Brahmin Catholic community of Trichinopoly. He afterwards wrote: "A Few Hints on the Lay-Apostolate," in which he exposed the methods experience had taught him as best fitted to win souls to Jesus Christ. His principles were, briefly:—

(1) Do not hurt the feelings of non-Christians by telling them at once that their religion is false and absurd.

(2) Be kind and sympathetic with the friend you wish to convert, lead him by degrees, slowly and patiently, to see things for himself, rather than point out to him where he is mistaken.

(3) Attack the false principle that all religions are good. This principle of indifferentism is the worst enemy of truth in India, for it closes the door to honest inquiry. Nevertheless do not forget that the unreasonableness of this error is by no means evident to those who have been educated to respect it.

Father Billard insisted on the necessity of removing this error from the minds of his would-be converts, and would not proceed further until he had done so. As soon as his disciple was convinced that only one religion could be true, it was easy for him to show that Hinduism and Christianity could not both be true, that Hinduism was self-contradictory since it comprised both truth and error, etc. To his arguments, of course, he added fervent prayer, and his converts are unanimous in saying that it was prayer that helped them through.

This method of private conversation, moreover, has an advantage over the public lecture in that it does not excite the pride of non-Christians. The commotion and wild talk which invariably follow a lecture on religion create an atmosphere of displeasure and excitement which does not favour the working of divine grace. Human respect, too, is all-powerful in India, and most Hindus would prefer death to the mockery and contempt of their fellow caste-men. One might say that all the high-caste converts who have persevered have played the part of Nicodemus for months and even years.

But private conversations have their drawbacks. An incalculable amount of time is spent on them, and, in very many cases, is entirely lost on them. Missionaries must be prepared for innumerable deceptions—scarcely one out of every

fifty Hindus under Father Billard's care ever reached the goal. First among those who approach the missionary to talk of religion is the common cheat, a plausible rogue who will even go to the length of receiving baptism in the hope of pecuniary assistance, and as many missionaries are very unworldly men, this rogue makes a lucrative trade of frequent baptism.

Next comes the sporting gentleman of theological tastes who takes up philosophical and theological discussion as a hobby, who, with not the slightest intention of changing his religion, comes to the Christian guru for a little relaxation after his day's work. He has innumerable difficulties to propose, and as fast as one is solved he jumps with the agility of an acrobat to another, and when he is finally cornered he will express his opinion of the Father as did a certain young undergraduate, who told the writer: "Father, excuse me, don't be offended; in this present life of yours your mind is too gross to understand me, in your next birth you will understand better."

There is the business man, who wishes to learn of the Catholic religion because this knowledge will help him to plead cases or to write articles for the Press. He is very assiduous in his visits, and, in his own way, is very sincere. When, after some months, the course is over, he thanks the missionary profusely, tells him that he will never forget the service rendered him, that he would never have mastered the subject so well with only the books to guide him . . . and goes his way.

Again, the Eclectic Indifferentist is very exasperating. He comes with a great desire to know our Lord and His doctrine, reads the Gospels with avidity and really tries to understand their meaning. He asks for an Imitation of Christ and spends much time reading it prayerfully. When, after a few months, the missionary asks him: "Well, my friend, will you do what Our Lord asks of you? Will you be baptized?" the good man answers: "Father, I admire and love our Lord Jesus Christ, Who is certainly an incarnation of God, but we in India have our own incarnation of God, the Lord Krishna. Christ for the West, Krishna for the East." These experiences are not fictitious, the writer has had many of the kind, and has come to the conclusion that with such people reasoning, logic, common sense are of no avail. Put the question: "Do you believe that both Hinduism and Christianity are true?" and if the inquirer

shows any inclination to reply in the affirmative, put an end to the conversation, and much time will be saved.

Finally, there is the upright soul, the man of sound judgment who is convinced of the truth, but lacks the courage required to act according to his conviction. The writer has seen several of these poor souls who wept at the thought of the terrible sacrifice entailed, and who went away never to return. Such souls are greatly to be pitied; only extraordinary grace can enable them to resist the appeal of a fond mother, the pleading of an aged father, the tears of a beloved wife.

The third method employed to convince the modern Hindu, which though perhaps the most practical, does not dispense with the other methods, is the diffusion of Catholic literature. In an enquiry instituted some ten years ago to find out how high caste converts had got their first notion of becoming Christians, out of 22 cases of personal conversion, 15 stated that a Catholic book, or pamphlet, or even a fly-sheet, had been the instrument by which the grace of God began its work in their souls. Father Billard knew this and tried every means to get Catholic literature from Europe and America to form a lending library for his Hindu friends. He also wrote booklets and pamphlets for the use of non-Christians, and thus, thirty years ago, laid the foundations of the present I.C.T.S. The Apostolate of the Press seems indeed to be the most important factor in the conversion of India; it multiplies the activities of the missionary a thousand-fold. The pity is that non-Catholics have understood this before us, for there are at least 150 Protestant weeklies or monthlies in circulation in India, while Catholics have barely 60. There are, besides, six Protestant societies busily producing pamphlets and tracts, but only one Catholic Society: *The Indian Catholic Truth Society*. For the consolation of those who have worked for the I.C.T.S., let it be said that, to the knowledge of the writer, not a few souls owe their conversion, under God, to its activities, and two of them are on their way to the priesthood.

Although many missionaries are beginning to understand the urgent necessity of the apostleship of the press, for both the defence and propagation of the faith, and although the I.C.T.S., thanks to the patronage of the Indian Hierarchy, publishes thousands of leaflets and tracts, only sporadic efforts have as yet been made to diffuse Catholic literature throughout this vast land. The *Morning Star* — the organ of the Indian

Sodalities—has, it is true, started among sodalists the movement, "Our Lady's Service," by which Catholic literature is posted, given, or lent to such non-Christians as are likely to make use of it, and, of late, efforts have been made to introduce Catholic books into public (non-Catholic) lending libraries and reading rooms. Of course, funds, are not sufficient for such a huge undertaking, and as Indian Catholics are not rich—many are too poor to buy literature for themselves—we need help from outside. For this we appeal to English, Irish and American Catholics to send us any Catholic literature for which they have no further use, and some funds to produce and distribute gratis more Catholic publications. We have 300,000,000 pagans to convert in this country, so the quantity you can send on to us need not be limited¹.

That vast number indicates that many years must elapse before public opinion in India will in practice tolerate conversion to Catholicism, but according as Catholic communities grow and spread the problem will be proportionately lighter. The racial pride which opposes instruction from the West is based on a misconception, for the cradle of Christianity was providentially placed between East and West to benefit both. We do not discuss here for lack of space, the important question of a native clergy, which, as the Pope has told us, is the ideal and consummation of all missionary effort.

LOUIS LACOMBE.

¹ Those who care to help in this way, or in any other their charity may suggest, are requested to address to: Rev. Fr. Louis Lacombe, S.J., St. Joseph's College, Trichinopoly.

A WORLD CONFERENCE OF THE SECTS

NO Catholic can regard with feelings other than sympathy and interest the great assembly at Lausanne which began its three-weeks sessions on August 3rd. The Holy Father himself has expressed his benevolent sympathy with the aim of the Conference, and it would ill beseem any of his children to show themselves hostile or indifferent to that recurrent phenomenon of our times—the earnest endeavour to control the fissiparous tendencies of Protestantism and to undo as much as possible its effects in the past. The light to see the harm wrought by disunion and the desire to bring it to an end are surely due to the action of the Holy Spirit. And the more often unity is sought in ways which necessarily cannot lead to it, the more likely it becomes that the true and only way will ultimately be sought for and found. There was no lack of zeal for truth in the five hundred members of the Conference, a zeal emphasized by the prolonged and elaborate preparation made for it. Nor have we any reason to doubt that personal devotion to our Lord and His ideals inspired its members. Even though foredoomed to failure in the main object of its meeting, the Conference must have enabled many to realize, as never before, what Christian unity means and what it does not. A clearer perception of that in the non-Catholic world will itself be an immense benefit.

The idea of "The World Conference on Faith and Order" originated in America. The energy and efficiency with which it has been carried out reflect the characteristic qualities of that great community. Church union amongst the sects makes more headway in the States than elsewhere, possibly because historic differences are less keenly felt, more probably because doctrinal differences are there shading away into a common indifference, whilst the moral decay, following on and due to the decay of faith, has reached colossal proportions, and forms a challenge to Christianity the like of which cannot be seen elsewhere in the world. The folly of religious divisions, themselves felt to be of slight importance, in face of this menace, is better seen where the

divisions are more numerous and the menace more extreme. However that may be, the fact is that non-Catholic Christians in the States have always taken the lead in trying to rouse the children of the Reformation to the scandal of religious dissension, its most obvious, natural and persistent result. As long ago as 1893 the Parliament of Religions was held in Chicago, with a purview so wide as to include the pre-Christian faiths. Long before the present attempts of the British Free Churches to form a sort of federation, a Federal Council of the Churches of Christ was formed in the States, an Inter-Church World Movement had a brief three years' existence from 1918 to 1921, whilst the present World Conference has its remote origin in an Episcopalian Convention at Cincinnati in 1910.

Its promoters had long views and were well-supported financially. They directed their attention first of all to securing adhesions in America: in 1913 a preliminary visit, interrupted by the war, was paid to Europe, followed in 1919 by an official American delegation which visited the Near East and Rome. Pope Benedict XV., who had previously in 1914 and 1915 expressed his interest in the movement, received the delegation with benevolence, but returned the only possible answer when asked for the active co-operation of the Catholic Church. The deputation reported in clear terms—"The contrast between the Pope's personal attitude towards us and his official attitude towards the Conference was very sharp. One was irresistibly benevolent, the other irresistibly rigid." After the warmth of their greeting by the Orthodox Schismatics this *non-possumus* attitude must have disappointed the zealous apostles of unity: nevertheless, the play proceeded with the part of Hamlet omitted. Armed with the adhesion of some seventy Christian Churches, 137 delegates met at Geneva in August, 1920, to debate the general agenda for the Conference, and appointed a Standing Committee to continue its task. After several years' work on data provided by innumerable local Conferences, which framed replies to lengthy *questionnaires*, the Continuation Committee took occasion of its meeting at Stockholm¹ in 1925 to determine the present year as the date for the assembly of the Conference at Lausanne.

¹ This, it may be noted, was not officially connected with the Faith and Order Conference, although it may have helped to suggest agenda for the later meeting. At Stockholm an even larger gathering discussed questions of "Life and Work," with, we fear, little practical result: See *THE MONTH* for Jan., 1926.

The composition of the agenda must have been a work of extraordinary difficulty. We know, from the failure of the 1920 Lambeth "Appeal for Unity" in this country to produce any real effect amongst the sects, and from the difficulties experienced here even by the "Free Churches" to find a basis for any sort of union, that harmony of belief and practice is incompatible with the principle of private judgment. Yet on such a fundamental question as the Unity of the Church, which the very existence of the bodies they represented in effect repudiates and denies, the Subjects Committee had so to determine the matter for discussion that no member of that heterogeneous gathering would find its assumptions too inconsistent with his religious position to participate.¹ We gather that the programme, under stress of irreconcilable differences, had to be rearranged more than once. It is all to the credit of the Committee that they were able finally to include in the agenda these seven far-reaching considerations:

1. The Call to Unity.
2. The Church's Message to the World,—the Gospel.
3. The Nature of the Church.
4. The Church's Common Confession of Faith.
5. The Church's Ministry.
6. The Sacraments.
7. The Unity of Christendom and the relations thereto of existing Churches.

Representatives of ninety-three non-Catholic sects,² to the number of 500, assembled to debate these seven topics and to endeavour to arrive at some more or less uniform conclusions in regard to each, not, of course, as regulations to bind their respective communities.

The delegates to Lausanne have no power to commit or compromise the Churches which they represent. They

¹ The question of Church Authority—surely the most vital of all—was expressly excluded from the agenda: so also were the Sacraments other than Baptism and the Holy Eucharist.

² These, of course, are a good deal less than half the progeny of the Reformation, and, as a matter of fact, many represented mere local divisions of widely-spread denominations. Anglicanism, for instance, sent fourteen separate delegations, and there were thirteen delegations from the Eastern Orthodox Churches. Bishop Brent's statement to an American interviewer, that "representatives of nearly one hundred *nation-wide* Churches" would assemble at Lausanne, savoured somewhat of hyperbole.

are there to express the mind of these Churches as far as they are able to do so, and to make their individual contributions to the common stock. But, whatever be the result of their deliberations and whatever conclusions the Conference, as a whole, may reach, these will have to be sent down to the different Churches, who will be perfectly free to accept or reject them at will. . . . The Conference is the creation of the Churches and, in a sense, their servant. It carries no other mandate than to explore the ground, exchange opinions, discuss and estimate difficulties, and report to the Churches that called it into being.¹

Small wonder that many of "the Churches," as Principal Selbie complains more than once in his article, showed no little apathy on the whole question of reunion. How could any religious body be enthusiastic about an investigation the result of which might possibly be to unChurch itself? "What Lausanne can do, and ought to do," writes Mr. Selbie, "is to discover how far there is agreement amongst the participating Churches on the great fundamentals of the Christian faith. . . . The discovery of any substantial unity on the main points of the Christian faith will constitute a challenge to the individual Churches which they can hardly evade or refuse to take up."² If substantial agreement on fundamentals is a thing still to be discovered, it cannot yet be obvious; its existence is doubtful; there may be disagreement, and, in that case, who is to decide which is a Christian Church? However, a considerable section of the non-Catholic religious bodies did actually face that risk, all unwitting that, in opening such an enquiry two thousand years or so after Pentecost, they were confessing themselves to have no part in the indefectible Church then established. We may now consider some of the conclusions arrived at; full reports, of course, are not yet published but quite enough is known of them to form a just estimate of the definite results of the Conference.

First of all we gladly admit that our separated brethren, as a whole, seem fully alive to the evils of separation. Followed by many other speakers, Bishop Brent gave them voice

¹ Principal W. B. Selbie, D.D., Congregationalist, a member of the Continuation Committee, in an article on "The Lausanne Conference"; *Hibbert Journal* for July.

² *Ibid.*

in his opening sermon, proclaiming that "Our Lord counts unity a necessity." So the Catholic Church, not waiting till A.D. 1927, has always taught, with the corollary that whatever our Lord, being God Almighty, counted a necessity for His Church, He endowed her with. The need of unity is indeed manifest for the work of redemption. If Christ's Church is to do what she was made for,—to carry on the work of its Founder—she must be one. A number of Churches, and those at variance with one another, is as grotesque and impossible a notion as a number of Christs or, for that matter, a number of Gods. It may well be that but for the defections from Christian unity brought about by Photius, Luther and their like, the evangelization of the world would by this time have been completed. As it is, besides the Church Catholic, there are scores of differing "Churches" at work in China and India. The representative of the Orthodox Patriarch of Constantinople, endorsing the Bishop's plea, pertinently said that, for unity, agreement in essential things was necessary. But to the obvious question—What are essential things?—the Orthodox prelate could only make the usual appeal to the dead documentary past—"all that is contained in the teaching of the ancient undivided Church of the first eight centuries"! Useless to tell such a constructive unbeliever in our Lord's power and promises that the ancient undivided Church has never, in the subsequent eleven centuries, ceased to exist, and that she lives to-day to keep and to interpret the deposit of faith she received from her Master. However, we are free to recognize that, in this Conference and apart from their initial inconsistency in joining it, the Orthodox have been more firm and uncompromising in asserting the faith they profess than many of their *démarches* with Anglicanism since the war led us to expect. The correspondent of the *Church Times* (August 19th) has reported "on good authority" that the Orthodox "have been threatening daily to withdraw from the Conference on account of some heretical doctrines put forward": also that Canon Douglas (an Anglican) "has been invaluable in persuading the Orthodox from leaving the Conference altogether." From which we may fairly infer that the claim made by the Metropolitan of Athens that the Orthodox Church alone possessed infallibility, provoked a certain amount of hostility. Anyhow, their feelings finally found expression in a memorandum declaring their inability

to sign any report, save that on the "Message of the Church."

This memorandum showed that the Easterns have at last realized that there can be no religious unity on a basis of individual experience and private judgment. It asserted quite frankly that the drafting of the reports on "The Nature of the Church" and "A Common Confession of Faith" "had been carried out on a basis of compromise between what, in their understanding, were conflicting ideas with conflicting meanings, in order to arrive at an external agreement in letters only." (*Times* report, August 19). And in reference to the reports not yet drafted, "the memorandum stated that the process of debate made it evident that agreement could only be reached by vague and ambiguous phrases or by a compromise of antithetical opinion" (*ibid.*). How very familiar we are, after the Anglican debates on the Revised Prayer Book, and through the whole Anglican controversy, with that experience! It is all to the good that it has thus become more generally felt. "Finding a formula" is the ordinary way of trying to reconcile opposites. More than one delegate protested in the same sense. Dr. Zollner, a German Evangelical, said that "no inward unity could be promoted by the construction of artificial formulæ." Dr. Arthur Titius, a theological professor from Berlin, on the presentation of the 2nd, 3rd, and 4th Reports, "warmly expressed the opinion that the Conference was getting over difficulties by the use of words with double meanings" (*Times* report, August 12th), whilst a native Indian bishop naïvely concluded "that so long as the Gospel message was confined to repentance and faith they were one, but disunion appears with the approach of defining what they meant" (*Church Times*, August 12th).

The various reports so far as they have appeared fully bear out these strictures. They are vague and rhetorical. The Church's message is said to be "the Gospel of Christ,"—again an appeal to a lifeless document, needing authentication and interpretation before it can convey its message. Nothing is said of the function of the Church in thus guaranteeing and making clear the Sacred Scriptures. And as for "the nature of the Church" itself—the third subject of consideration—no definition is provided, although, in any rational discussion on Unity, the determination of what the Church, of which unity is an attribute, actually is should logically precede everything else. The description, of course,

had to be framed so as to include, in one way or another, each of the hundred sects represented at the Conference, and so the visible unity of the Church was left an open question.

As there is but one Christ and one life in Him and one Holy Spirit, so there is but one Church, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic, visible and invisible. [This last epithet is perhaps intended to cover the grotesque conception of 'invisible unity.'] . . . Some believe the visible expression of this Church was determined by Christ Himself and is unchangeable: others believe that one Church may express itself in varied forms. But we are agreed that the one Life of the one Body should be manifest to the world by the visible unity of its members. Different views are taken of the divisions. A view in one direction is that no division has ever come to pass without sin. A view in the other direction is that the divisions were the outcome of the different gifts of the spirit. Between them, there is a body of opinion which looks upon these divisions with penitence and sorrow. [Is not this merely another form of the first-mentioned view?] We are agreed that they present obstacles to the accomplishment of the Church's task which it is our duty to remove [in spite of the possibility of their being 'the outcome of the different gifts of the spirit'!]

Then we are told that the "marks" of the Church are:

(a) Belief in the Bible as God's word, (b) Belief in God incarnate in Christ, (c) the observance of the Sacraments, (d) a Ministry, (e) a fellowship in prayer, in worship, in all the means of grace; but we are not told how those beliefs are externally manifested, how many and what Sacraments are "observed," whether the Ministry is man-made or sacramental, what kind of fellowship in prayer, etc., should be displayed. And what is admittedly the chief mark of the Church, her Unity—her oneness in belief and worship and government—is altogether omitted from her "Notes." Lip-homage is paid to the ideal of the "One Church" and then admissions are made wholly incompatible with that ideal—"the compromise of antithetical opinion" which revolted the Orthodox delegates.

If the Conference could arrive at no clear and consistent conception of the Church of Christ, which He was at such pains to describe in the Gospels, and of which St. Paul has

¹ *Church Times* report, August 19th.

described so vividly the essential characteristics, we could not expect any more success with the fourth subject of debate—The Church's common profession of faith. It may be briefly described as the Bible and the Creeds (Apostles' and Nicene), interpreted as you please. "It is understood that the ways in which these Creeds may be used shall be determined by the competent authority in each Church. It is understood also that the several Churches will continue to make free use of such special Confessions as they possess." We read and rub our eyes and ask—"Is not the Conference working to produce unity of faith in the Church of Christ? Why then this free hand given to its supposed component parts to select from the Bible and the Creeds or from their own spiritual experience whatever special Confessions seem good to them?" Once again, in the absence of any fixed and authentic interpretation, how in the wide world are formulæ, however sacred, to convey the same message to the myriad minds of men. The old stark Protestantism of "The Bible and the Bible only" appears in an elucidation of the report sent to *The Times* (August 13th) by the Bishop of Gloucester, to the effect that "it is the faith of Christ we accept and not the creed," and that we must put in the forefront "the Holy Scriptures as the source of our knowledge of the faith of Christ." It is precisely because unguided and misguided men have gone to the Scriptures alone for "the faith of Christ" that the scandal of Protestant divisions has arisen.

The same spirit of compromise characterizes the report on "the Church's Ministry" which declares that "in view of the fact that Episcopal, Presbyteral and Congregational Order are each believed by many to be essential in the Order of the Church, therefore we recognize that these several elements must all, *in conditions which require further study*, have an appropriate place in the order of life of a re-united Church." We feel that the chief inspirer of that suggestion must have been the Lutheran delegate from America, who declared that his Church "was 'libero-electic,' being neither episcopal, presbyterian, nor congregational, but a mixture of them all"! We may note that the phrase in italics practically leaves the question where it was: the means of harmonizing three diverse methods of Church-government have yet to be devised.

The final questions need not delay us. In the debate on the Sacraments an Orthodox Bishop put the case for seven

and an English Congregationalist that for two, but no report at the time of writing is to hand. Nor has any decision yet been come to regarding "The Unity of Christendom and the relations thereto of existing Churches," on which discoursed the Lutheran Archbishop of Upsala and the Protestant Bishop of Gloucester. But, considering their speeches, the prospect of unity on the lines they suggested vanishes altogether. Neither they nor, for all that we can see, any member of the Conference has even the beginning of a conception of the only means by which such unity as Christ desired for His Church can be secured and preserved. They all, implicitly or openly, repudiate the idea of the Living Infallible Authoritative Voice, the Visible Headship of the Visible Church wielded by the successor of St. Peter. We have seen that the promoters of the Conference faced the idea for a moment, only to set it aside. We read, under their resumé of the seventh subject for discussion—"The questions which concern the necessity of a central authority for the whole of Christendom are of the utmost importance; but the Conference, while recognizing this importance, thinks it inadvisable to include the consideration of them in its programme for these sessions." Is not that a tacit confession that not one of the hundred disparate bodies gathered together at Lausanne would consent even to discuss "the necessity of a central authority for the whole of Christendom"? Yet before the Eastern Schisms and before the Reformation, the principle that maintained the unity of Christendom was precisely that central authority, considered and accepted by the faithful as of divine institution. In the nature of things, apart from constant supernatural intervention, God could hardly have devised any other means of guaranteeing and preserving supernatural truth amongst men. Even in matters of science, which are subject to human investigation and reason, a consensus of opinion is built up only with difficulty and is always subject to revision. But the revelation of supernatural truth which is intended to direct mind and heart to righteousness, and which of its own nature is beyond the range of sense and is not subject to the verdict of reason, must be certain and substantially complete, if it is to attain its purpose. Hence the necessity of an infallible authority, persisting unchanged amidst all generations of men, to convey the divine message with clearness and assurance. The Lausanne Conference is in itself an admission that, by a large number

of those who claim to be Christians, Christ's message is imperfectly known and insecurely held. An argument for union frequently heard and expressed more than once at the Conference, notably by Bishop Gore—that each of the various “Churches” has severally preserved some individual aspect of truth which the others cannot afford to ignore, and that, inferentially, complete truth can only be obtained by the pooling of their distinct contributions—what is this but a pitiable admission that for them God has spoken, partly at least, in vain. The Church which was founded in the Holy Spirit was to be taught *all* truth by His abiding influence. The members of that Church need not look elsewhere for the full revelation of God, nor need wait to learn from others new ways of approach to Him. As for those others—is not this assertion at least very probable? If the unity of Christendom (not, of course, that of the Catholic Church) has been lost, solely by the rejection of the principle of Authority, presumably the only way to restore it is to accept that principle once more. The Conference ended by electing a representative Continuation Committee to carry on the work of “organizing for Church Unity” in the after years. Let us hope that the subject which will first occupy the attention of that Committee will be the fundamental question—“Did Christ establish, to teach and rule His Church to the end of time, a divinely-guaranteed Authority?” For if so, the conditions for unity which that Authority lays down are those determined by God Himself.

The nature, the composition and the actual proceedings of this very well-meant but pathetically futile assemblage of non-Catholic Christian bodies have put beyond dispute the wisdom of the Catholic Church in refusing to have part or lot with it. “You have described your Conference,” said Pius XI. to the earnest men who begged his participation in the earlier meeting at Stockholm, “as a Congress of seekers for the truth. We are not seekers, for we have long since found it.” At Lausanne they were looking for unity,—how could the one and only Church of Christ pretend to join in that search? Yet the promoters of the Conference were exceedingly desirous to win for their gathering the immense *éclat* which the representation there of the Catholic Church would confer, and they exerted themselves to obtain, if not some actual delegates, at least some authoritative exposition of Catholic doctrine which would involve an acceptance of the

Conference as a gathering of genuine "Churches." However, the only possible policy of the Holy See had been so often and so plainly manifested that no Catholic could go beyond expressions of sympathy for the object of the Conference. There was none of that ill-advised minimizing of Catholic doctrine and misreading of Catholic history which in recent years have marked the attitude of certain zealous members of the Church towards the Anglican project of "Corporate Reunion." Nevertheless, by way of precaution, the Holy Office, on July 8th of this year, and expressly in reference to Lausanne, renewed its prohibition against Catholic participation in meetings designed to promote "reunion." The prohibition took the form of a negative answer to the following question—"Is it lawful for Catholics to join in or support non-Catholic meetings, assemblies, addresses or societies, which have for aim the union in one religious federation of all who on whatever grounds claim the name of Christian?"¹—and it expressly renewed that previously issued on June 4th, 1919, which gives the doctrinal reasons on which the prohibition is based. The conduct of the Church, in respect to other religious bodies claiming the name of Christian, is dictated by her immutable belief that she alone holds Christ's commission to teach and rule His flock. "To the Roman Catholic," writes the Rev. Prof. C. M. Jacobs,² "the Church is one organization existing by God's will, and teaching with supreme authority and definite. The Conference will not adopt the Roman view of the Church." And therefore on mere grounds of common sense the Catholic Church held aloof from the Conference.³

As we stated above, the most practical effect to be hoped for from Lausanne is a fuller realization by those outside the Fold of the anomalies and discomforts and dangers of their position. Some of the participants despaired of any real approach to unity in Faith and Order, the non-credal and non-episcopal elements being so strong. Failing acceptance of a definite creed, the "Churches" should, in the opinion of Bishop Gore (*Times*, August 8th), "devote them-

¹ *Acta Apostolicæ Sedis*. August 1, 1927.

² In "Can the Churches Unite?"—a collection of essays on unity issued previous to the Lausanne Conference by the Continuation Committee.

³ An admirable exposition, doctrinal and historical of the Catholic position *vis à vis* Lausanne and all similar conceptions may be found in "The Catholic Attitude towards the Conference on Christian Unity" by the Rev. W. H. McClellan, S.J. (The America Press: 5 cents).

selves to the more feasible task of uniting all those who profess the name of Christ, without regard to doctrinal or sacramental differences, in an earnest pursuit of the moral and social aims of Christianity," and Bishop Manning, of New York, endorsed that opinion. But Christian morality is based upon Christian faith, and the spread of such evils as divorce, race-suicide, literary and dramatic licence, sweating, etc., in communities professedly Christian, shows how imperfect therein the Christian faith has become. The experience of Stockholm, two years ago, proves that no united front can be presented to the evils of the day unless in the strength of a complete and firm faith.

Proceedings ended on Saturday, August 20th, by the adoption of the Reports on the Christian Ministry and the Sacraments which, together with the others and a Preamble by Bishop Brent, form a "Declaration to all Christendom on the subject of Christian Unity." The seventh Report, on "the Unity of Christendom in relation to existing Churches," could not be discussed or adopted owing to lapse of time, although it raises points of acute interest and importance. The preamble is in a very subdued key, claiming that the object of the Conference was merely "to register the apparent level of fundamental agreement and the grave points of difference remaining, and to suggest certain lines of thought which may in the future tend to a fuller measure of agreement." What the impartial observer will be apt to conclude from this piano utterance is that the Conference, despite all the good will of its conveners and participants, has registered only futility and defeat. It could not, in the circumstances, have been otherwise.

A curious and suggestive decision ordained that the standard text of the complete Declaration should be in Greek.

JOSEPH KEATING.

MISCELLANEA

I. CRITICAL AND HISTORICAL NOTES

SOME PARALLELS TO THE "MEMORARE."

THOUGH the many learned researches of the last half century have revealed no evidence of St. Bernard's authorship of the *Memorare*, some writers still call it "the prayer of St. Bernard."¹

The most ancient collections of prayers in which the *Memorare* is to be found date from the last quarter of the fifteenth century, although we do not find the prayer in the short form, familiar to-day throughout the whole Christian world, but as part of a longer formula beginning: "*Ad sanctitatis tue pedes, dulcissima Virgo Maria*"² In the first half of the seventeenth century the *Memorare*, separated henceforth from its original context, and made independent, was used in France, where a certain Claude Bernard, known as the "poor priest" (†1641), greatly helped in its popularization.³ "Mgr. Camus relates," says M. Vacandard, "that St. Francis of Sales recited the prayer each day, and Claude Bernard himself tells us that he had it from his father, who, in turn, had learnt it from the lips of St. Francis."⁴ The authorship of the *Memorare* has evidently been attributed to St. Bernard owing to a confusion between the names of Claude Bernard and the great client of Our Lady in the twelfth century, St. Bernard of Clairvaux, whose devotion to Mary was so well known.

The prayer contains three principal ideas which may be summed up in the following phrases: *

1. Remember, O most loving Virgin Mary, that it has never been known that anyone who had recourse to thee was left unaided.

2. Inspired by this confidence, to thee do I come, O Virgin of virgins, imploring thy help.

3. Despise not my prayers, O Mother of the Word.

¹ For example Clement Sclafert, *Un jongleur de Notre-Dame* (Etudes, 5 Dec. 1924, pp. 564-565); *L'Office liturgique de chaque jour*, by Dom. F. Cabrol and Dom. J. Baudot; *Missel* (Tours [1925]), p. 1,733.

² N. Paulus, *Das Alter des Gebets Memorare* (Zeitschrift für Katholische Theologie, XXVI, 1902, pp. 604-606); H. Thurston, *Notes on familiar prayers* (Month, CXXXII, 1918, pp. 275-277). The last named article translated into French by Mgr. A. Boudinhon, *Le Souvenez-vous* (Revue du clergé français, C, 1919, pp. 246-260).

³ On Claude Bernard, see H. Thurston, *loc. cit.*; *Catholic Encyclopaedia* art. *Bernard (Claude)*; H. Bricout, art. *Memorare*, in the *Dictionnaire pratique des connaissances religieuses*.

⁴ E. Vacandard, art. *Bernard (Claude)* in the same Dictionary.

If there be a prayer breathing absolute confidence in Mary, it is surely this one. "*Devotus Mariae nunquam peribit*" was the mediæval idea. Fidelity to Mary is a pledge of salvation. The whole Mariology of the Middle Ages proclaims this truth, abundantly illustrated in the books of *legenda*, *exempla*, and *miracula* of Our Lady, so numerous after the eleventh century and reiterated in the prayers, hymns, and in the works of the spiritual writers of the period.¹

We shall now make a selection from these texts, and note those which bear the closest resemblance to the dominant ideas of the *Memorare*, as well as to the vocabulary and phraseology of the author of this pious prayer. Even if these comparisons do not lead us to suggest the name of the author, they will at least help us to realize that this short and beautiful prayer is a faithful reflection of the spirit of mediæval devotion to the Mother of God.

The idea of the unfailing efficacy of Mary's intercession, so strongly expressed in the *Memorare*, stands out in almost all the prayers to the Blessed Virgin attributed to St. Anselm of Canterbury.² The same thought is apparent in the following lines said to have come from the pen of the Anglo-Norman poet Wace:

Qui l'amera et servira
Et de bon cuer l'onnorera
N'i faudra pas qu'il n'ait s'aie³
Ou a la mort ou a la vie.⁴

Eadmer, contemporary and biographer of St. Anselm, discloses that God exalted Our Lady to such a degree that through His grace all things are possible to her.⁵

St. Bernard himself frequently echoes this declaration, especially in the passage of the famous *Sermo de Aquaeductu*, where he says: "*Totis ergo medullis cordium, totis praecordiorum affectibus et votis omnibus Mariam hanc veneremur, quia sic est voluntas eius qui totum nos habere voluit per Mariam.*"⁶ "*Felix Maria, quam qui perseveranter amaverit, non peribit,*"

¹ The literature of the legends of Our Lady flourished luxuriantly. Kaulen has given in the article *Marienlegenden* in the *Kirchenlexikon* of Hergenröther-Kaulen, a very good summary of this literature. On the absolute confidence of the middle ages in Mary's intercession, according to the *legenda*, *exempla*, and *miracula*, consult J. Nothomb, *La légende de Notre-Dame*, Bruges, 1924, pp. 31-52.

² *Orationes* (P.L., CLVIII, 942-966).

³ "Son aide ne lui fera pas défaut."

⁴ Quoted by Bridgett (*Our Lady's Dowry*, London, 1875, p. 372), who does not give the exact reference. I have not been able to find these lines in *La vie de la Vierge Marie* of Maistre Wace, ed. V. Luzarche (Tours, 1859), a work formerly published by Mancel and Trébutien under the title: *L'établissement de la fête de la Conception Notre-Dame dite la fête aux Normands* (Caen, 1842).

⁵ *De excellentia Virginis*, 12 (P.L., CLIX, 578).

⁶ *Sermo de Aquaeductu*, 7 (P.L., CLXXXIII, 441).

says another Cistercian Abbot, Adam of Perseigne († c. 1221).¹

Especially striking in the *Memorare* is the assertion that the lovers of Mary have continually experienced the power of her intercession and protection. There are many parallels to this in the spiritual literature of the Middle Ages. In a collection of miracles of Our Lady, wrongly attributed to Boto of Prüfening² (who lived in the middle of the twelfth century), but which is anterior to this author, we find the following prayer: "Obtine precibus tuis apud Filium tuum Jesum Christum Dominum Nostrum, qui nihil negat tibi, te semper honorat, quatenus munus fecunditatis mihi sterili sua gratia largiatur."³

A hymn discovered by Mone in a twelfth century manuscript, and which begins thus,

Ecce ad te confugio,
Virgo nostra salvacio,
Spes salutis et venie,
Mater misericordie,

contains also the following verse which must be quoted:

Nullus enim jam perdetur,
Nullus enim confundetur,
Qui se tibi commendabit,
Qui te pure invocabit.⁴

Speaking of the Mother of God, Eadmer affirms: "Procul dubio namque scimus eam tanti esse penes te [O Jesu], ut nihil horum quae volet efficere aliquatenus possit effectu carere."⁵ "Nor shall any man that worships thee ever be lost" (ne no mon, that de wurtheth, ne mei neuer beon vorloren), says too a prayer in Middle English, overflowing with loving enthusiasm, and believed to come from St. Edmund of Canterbury.⁶

Lastly, of the two texts of St. Bernard which M. Vacandard compares with the *Memorare*,⁷ one at least must certainly be

¹ *Mariale*, Sermon 2 (P.L., CCXI, 715). See the editor's notes, col. 763-764.

² On the wrong attribution of this work to Boto, see A. Mussafia, *Studien zu den mittelalterlichen marienslegenden* (Sitzungsb. Akad. Wissensch. Wien, CXIX, 1889, p. 54 ff.) and J. A. Endres, *Botho von Prüfening und seine schriftstellerische Tätigkeit* (Neues Archiv., XXX, 1904, p. 612 ff.).

³ *Liber de miraculis Sanctae Dei Genetricis Mariae*, ed. B. Pez. (Viennae, 1731), p. 355. This work has just been re-edited by F. Crane (*Cornell University Studies in Romance Languages*, Vol. I., 1925).

⁴ Ul. Chevalier, *Repert. hymnol.*, No. 5087; Mone, *Lateinische hymnen*, II, p. 361.

⁵ *De Conceptione B.M.*, (P.L., CLIX, 314).

⁶ *On god Ureismun of ure Lefdi*, v. 74, ed. Richard Morris; *Old English Homilies and homiletic Treatises of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries* (E.E.S.S. 1st series, pp. 194-195), ed. J. Zupitza; and J. Schipples, *Alt- und Mittelenglisches Übungsbuch*, Wien and Leipzig, 1912, p. 114. On the attribution to St. Edmund, see Willy Marufke, *Die älteste englische Marien hymnus* (Koch and Sarrazin's *Breslauer Beiträge zur Literaturgeschichte*, 1907, Heft 13) cf. J. E. Wells, *A Manual of the writings in Middle English*, New Haven (Connecticut), 1923, pp. 536, 854, 1134. The last named author should have added to his list of references that of the careful article by Father H. Thurston, *Two alleged English Poems of St. Edmund of Canterbury* (*Tablet*, 5 Dec. 1908, pp. 883-885).

⁷ E. Vacandard, *Vie de St. Bernard*, Paris, 1897, t. II, p. 96.

noted: "Sileat misericordiam tuam, Virgo beata, si quis est qui, invocantem te in necessitatibus suis sibi meminerit defuisse."¹

All these texts, selected from works of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, present as an unquestionable fact and almost as an axiom, that Mary has never failed to bring aid to her clients. It would be wrong, however, to believe that such a conviction was not reached before the twelfth century. See, for example, what we find in the Paraclitic Canon of Phocius, Patriarch of Constantinople († 891). "Night and day I call on thee [O Mary]," he writes, "throwing myself suppliant at thy feet, flying to thee in my weakness. . . . No one can seek refuge in thy goodness without the certainty of winning thy compassion; no one, O Lady most pure, can place himself under thy patronage without obtaining an answer to his prayers."²

Another prayer, this time from the West and still older than that of Phocius, is especially worthy of a place side by side with the *Memorare*. It is to be found in the Book of Cerne written in Mercia in the first decades of the ninth century. The entire Latin text must be quoted here: "Sancta dei genitrix, semper virgo, beata, benedicta, gloriosa et generosa, intacta et intemerata, casta et incontaminata, Maria immaculata, electa et a deo dilecta, singulari sanctitate praedita atque omni laude digna, quae es interpellatrix pro totius mundi discrimina (*read: discrimine*) exaudi, exaudi nos sancta Maria. Ora pro nobis et intercede et auxiliare ne dedigneris. Confidimus enim et pro certo scimus quia omne quod vis potes impetrare a filio tuo domino nostro iesu christo deo omnipotenti, omnium saeculorum rege, qui vivit cum patre et spiritu sancto in saecula saeculorum. Amen."³

We have mentioned that the Book of Cerne was written at the beginning of the ninth century, but the prayer *Sancta Dei Genitrix* shows peculiarities which led Edmund Bishop to assign its composition to the early years of the preceding century. He even believed it to date from as far back as the seventh century. He saw in this outpouring of devotion to Mary, in a strain certainly rather unusual at this period, the stamp of the Irish genius influenced by Spanish piety, upon which perhaps an earlier Syrian influence had been at work.⁴ However this may be, what

¹ In *Assumptione*, Serm. IV, 8 (P.L., CLXXXIII, 428).

² Ode I, ed. Antonius Ballerini, *Sylloge monumentorum ad mysterium Conceptionis immaculatae Virginis Deiparae illustrandum*, Parisiis, 1855, I, p. 481. cf. C. Emereau, *Hymnographi Byzantini* (*Echos d'Orient*, XXIV, 1925, p. 168-169).

³ *Oratio ad sanctam Mariam*, No. 56, ed. A. B. Kuypers, *The Prayer Book of Aedelwald the Bishop commonly called the Book of Cerne*, Cambridge 1902, pp. 154-155. Before the publication of the *Book of Cerne*, this prayer had already been published by F. A. Paley in 1862 (see E. Bishop, *Liturgica historica* Oxford, 1918, p. 174) and by an anonymous writer in an article entitled: *The Liturgy and Ritual of the Anglo-Saxon Church* (*Church Quarterly Review*, XIV, 1882, p. 293).

⁴ E. Bishop, *Liturgica historica*, pp. 174-178. On the traces of "Irishry" in the *Book of Cerne*, see also Bishop's important note in *Lit. hist.* pp. 192-197.

is important to note here is the indisputable resemblance between the prayer *Sancta Dei Genetrix* and the *Memorare*.¹ In both cases there is the same filial trustfulness, the same urgent prayer, the same confidence in the boundless power of the Mother of God.

Still, in the *Memorare* there is a nuance which is neither to be found in the English prayer nor in any of the other texts we have cited. Many of them delight in accentuating the well-known fame of Mary for her blessings, but the *Memorare* begins by reminding our heavenly Mother with touching simplicity that she must not forget the widespread reputation of her name, and that this is one more reason for continuing her inexhaustible favours to her children.

L. GOUGAUD, O.S.B.

ANGLICAN CHURCH HISTORY CORRECTED.

CONSIDERABLE interest has been raised in a small book recently published, entitled "General Councils and Anglican Claims."² The author is the Rev. S. Herbert Scott, D.Ph., B.Litt., an Anglican clergyman of the "Anglo-Catholic" school, and Rector of Oddington. The subject, as Dr. Scott tells us, is "The Council of Ephesus, the Primacy of the Holy See, and the Anglican Appeal," and the "object is to indicate to what—regarding the position and function claimed and exercised by the Bishop of Rome, or the office and duty recognized as belonging to him, at this Council—the Anglican Church, by its acceptance of General Councils, appears to be committed" (p. 11). "It seems to me," says Dr. Scott (p. 56), "that if the Church of England accepts that Council [of Ephesus], the Church of England is bound to accept not only what it says, enacts, inscribes, but also what it pre-supposes, implies, acknowledges." Now, to summarize the author's statement, that is: the Primacy of the Bishop of Rome as the successor of St. Peter, to whom it was given by Christ, held, therefore, by St. Peter's successors *de jure divino*. It is maintained that "the documents of the Council of Ephesus [to take no others] show that these Eastern Councils . . . acknowledged the power and right of the Roman bishop to declare authoritatively to the Universal Church what the Catholic Faith was" (p. 56).

Dr. Scott's exposition is, as one would expect, learned, succinct, and well-ordered. It is unusually interesting, owing to

¹ On the frequent use of the expression *Mater Verbi* of the *Memorare*, from St. Andrew of Crete up to the end of the Middle Ages, see H. Marraccius, *Encomia Mariana: Polyanthea Mariana*, a work contained in the *Summa aurea de laudibus B.V.M.* by J. J. Bourassé, Paris, 1866, vol. IX. col. 1404-1449.

² Sheed and Ward: 1s.

the circumstances of its genesis, and to the motive of its publication, which is, as we learn (p. 54), "Reunion." But it is quite possible to exaggerate its significance, and to overrate its importance. Its appearance certainly does not mean that "Anglo-Catholic" scholars will henceforth admit the antiquity of the "Papal claims," nor even that they will recognize that these claims were fully admitted by the Easterns; still less does it imply that official Anglicanism will accept Dr. Scott's contentions and conclusions, of which it will probably take little if any notice. If they are not controverted they will be ignored. It is quite true that the Church of England, in its formularies, appeals to the "first four General Councils," but it does not admit their infallibility. On the contrary, as the XXI. Article of Religion shows. It may be well to recall its terms: "General Councils may not be gathered together without the commandment and will of princes. And when they be gathered together, forasmuch as they be an assembly of men, whereof all be not governed with the Spirit and Word of God, they may err, and sometimes have erred, in things pertaining to God." In fact, the Church of England has, to use a common expression, no use for infallibility, which would interfere very awkwardly with its traditional reliance on the use of private judgment and its cherished policy of comprehension. It has been shrewdly noticed (in the *Catholic Gazette* of July of this year) that the word "infallibility" does not occur once in Dr. Scott's book, but that the author "seems rather to hint at further explanations" of the Catholic dogma of Papal Infallibility. Dr. Scott, indeed, says that "the definitions of 1870 are open to 'explication'," and he quotes words of Dom Beauduin in *Irenikon* (of April):—"on peut envisager des élucidations doctrinales ultérieures mieux adaptées à des mentalités et des modes de penser nouveaux. Rien ne s'oppose à ce qu'un Concile oecuménique futur ne revienne par *voie d'explication* authentique sur des décisions dogmatiques antérieures" (pp. 57, 58),—words which, however correct in the sense in which Catholics may take them, are very liable to misapprehension by Anglicans. It is not very clear what Dr. Scott and Dom Beauduin expect; possibly some *explication* which will show that the pronouncement of Leo XIII. on Anglican Orders is not irreformable! We fear that that door is closed. It is impossible to think that any Catholic can look for an explanation which can somehow or other open the way to a recognition of the Church of England as a "part of the Catholic Church," or even as a body in a position similar to one of the Eastern Orthodox Churches. It is instructive to read in connection with this an article by the Rev. K. D. McKenzie, in the July number of *Theology* (S.P.C.K.), in which Dom Beauduin is quoted as writing: "Our wish is that in uniting itself to us in

dogmatic unity, a part at least of the Anglican Church should bring to us by *its uninterrupted continuity* (italics ours) the most desirable riches of that life which is its own special possession." And again: "A Church of England absorbed by Rome and a Church of England separate from Rome are two conceptions equally inadvisable. Could not one seek a formula in the middle, the only historical way: a Church of England filially united with Rome?" As was pointed out at length in THE MONTH¹ for November, 1926, the Catholic Church in England bears the same filial relationship with Rome as she always did, neither absorbed by, nor separated from, her Mother Church. And the unfortunate phrase "its uninterrupted continuity" emphasizes the confusion of thought which "seeks a formula"—how this savours of Anglican discussions!—for a relationship already existing.

No Catholic who had any intimate knowledge of, or practical acquaintance with, Anglicanism could have written such sentences as those quoted, which, however understood, have no relation to reality. It is well known that the work for which the "Monks of Union" were instituted has reference to the restoration to Catholic unity of the separated Eastern Churches. The conversion of Anglicans is a matter of another kind. It may, perhaps, be permitted to recall in this case the old maxim, *ne sutor ultra crepidam*. These zealous men, by travelling, uninvited and unassisted by the English Catholic authorities, outside their commission, are doing positive harm to the Catholic cause here.

In estimating the probable effect of Dr. Scott's book on "our separated brethren," it is quite necessary to have some understanding of Anglican methods of argument and use of Catholic terms—such as "unity," "primacy," and "authority." It would seem impossible for an Anglican to use them in the Catholic sense and to remain an Anglican. Anglican convictions and doctrines are always, in the last resort, based upon the private interpretation, if not of Holy Scripture, yet of history and tradition. The method which they use to prove even Catholic positions is not that of Catholics. All Catholics are, of course, confident that an appeal to antiquity will justify and confirm their teaching and belief as to the Papal Supremacy, or of any other Catholic doctrine, but they do not base their belief upon their interpretation of history, of the Fathers, or of the witness of ancient Councils. As Dr. Adrian Fortescue puts it—with the clarity and force which were pre-eminently his—in his book entitled "The Early Papacy":—

I am quite sure that Matthew xvi., Clement of Rome, Irenaeus, Chrysostom, Augustine, say what I believe about

¹ "Was Canterbury ever a Patriarchate?"

the Bishop of Rome. But I do not base any faith on what they say. . . . I base my faith on what the Catholic Church of to-day says. That alone is quite enough for us all; in this we have an argument perfectly clear, convincing, final, the same for the student of patrology as for a peasant who can neither read nor write (*op. cit.* pp. 7 and 8).

And again:—

The criterion for faith about the Papacy is for us what the Catholic Church teaches in 1920 [the date of his book]. We shall never get forward in discussion with people on any one dogma till we agree about this, that the authority of the Church to-day is the criterion for all dogmas (p. 6).

Now, such considerations and conclusions as these contained in Dr. Scott's candid book may—and it is to be hoped will—serve to remove hindrances from the minds of some Anglicans, who, thoroughly dissatisfied with the Church of England, are kept back from going to the root of the matter, and facing the principle question, by supposed historical difficulties. Instead of starting from principles to reach necessary conclusions, and proceeding to argue that what seem to be historical difficulties, or even contradictions, must have some explanation or solution, most Anglicans take certain interpretations of facts, or some presentations of history, as certainly true, and conclude that dogmas which seem to clash with them have no validity, and must be repudiated, unless some interpretation of them can be found to reconcile them with what is supposed to be historically true, or, in other words, to explain them away—a mental process which is thoroughly Protestant. It may be, then, that the removal of prejudices arising from a false view of history, and the solution of difficulties which bar the way, may lead some to further enquiry, and clear the path for a consideration of the true grounds of faith, and of the Papal Supremacy as a doctrine taught by the infallible Church of to-day and of the centuries.

On the other hand, historical arguments of the kind in question always lead to rejoinders and rebuttals—they are never actually incontrovertible—and assist to keep the minds of the majority of non-Catholics off investigation into the actual nature of Papal Supremacy, so that the discussion leads to little or nothing useful, as has been the case in the secular controversy on the *Tu es Petrus*. Moreover, the object of such endeavours as this on the part of Anglicans is to further the cause of "Reunion." Dr. Scott tells us (p. 54): "Re-union, of course, is the thought, the object, which lies at the back of all this examination and exposition. *Rome, Constantinople, Canterbury, are all pledged to this Council of Ephesus.*"¹ [*Italics sic*]. Now, of course, this means "cor-

¹ True; but the pledge is not taken by each in the same way.

porate reunion," and implies the Anglican theory of a divided Church—some form of the "Branch Theory." Always it is assumed that the Anglican theory of the Church is valid, and that the Church of England is a part of the Catholic Church, unfortunately separated from the main body. When the present writer was vicar of an Anglican parish, a bright little girl in the VII. Standard of the parochial schools wrote in an examination paper on the subject of "Church History": "Our Patriarch is the Bishop of Rome; but unfortunately he will have nothing to do with us."!

Now, discussions such as these in question serve to keep alive this delusion, tend to camouflage, or to condone, the tacit assumption of a false theory, and so keep the minds of enquirers off questions which really matter, encourage the pursuit of a chimerical project, and are, on the whole, an obstacle rather than a help to the discovery of Catholic truth. It is not the Papal Claims, as such, but the nature and endowments of the Church, which is the real crux of the controversy between Anglicans and Catholics, and no discussion of the position and prerogatives of the Papacy in the early Church—or in the Church of any age, for that matter—can possibly be fruitful of unitive action, so long as Anglicans assume and cling to their theory of a divisible Church.

It must be, primarily, this theory which hinders such serious enquirers as Dr. Scott, and those who agree with him, from pursuing their argument to its logical conclusion—from seeing what "it pre-supposes, implies and acknowledges." If they themselves, with the Council of Ephesus, acknowledge "the power and right of the Roman bishop to declare authoritatively to the Universal Church what the Catholic Faith (is)"—if they believe that "the Headship of the Church," given by Christ to St. Peter, "was passed on, and was in fact inherited by his successors in the bishopric of Rome, so that the bishops of Rome hold *their* headship therefore *de jure divino*"—why do they not submit to the Pope's judgment on the character and position of the Church of England, and the invalidity of Anglican Orders? Why do they not receive his teaching as to the nature of the Church, and recognize that they are, therefore, themselves outside the Church? What else but their own presupposed theory of the Church, and their failure to realize what the Papal *magisterium* implies, keeps them where they are, in the vain hope that some day even a considerable proportion of Anglicans will come to agree with their interpretation of history, and that then some sort of "corporate reunion" will be possible, without individual submission and reception into the Church? If they were really convinced of the full claim of the Papal authority on the consciences of Christians, could they fail to see that no such hope—

however plausible—can justify those who hold what the Council of Ephesus held with regard to the Papacy, in rejecting the Pope's teaching and decisions, and in remaining out of communion with the Head of the Church, and, therefore, with the Body of which he is the Head? Could they fail to see that if they wait for "explanations" of the Vatican decrees, they do so at the risk of their own souls? Those who encourage, in any way, their misapprehensions, their hesitation and postponement of decision, bear, surely, a grave responsibility.

W. A. SPENCE.

RECOLLECTIONS OF OLD ROME.

READING lately of a Consistory held by Pope Pius XI., with all its quaint and old-world ceremonial, my thoughts were carried back to just such another scene in the Vatican close on half a century ago, when the great Pontiff Leo XIII., a few weeks after his election, presided over a similar function.

"The new Pope," the special correspondent of *The Times*, Signor Gallenga, telegraphed to his journal on February 20, 1878, "is fifteen years older than Pius IX. was at his accession, and has certainly no chance of exceeding the years of Peter." The event, as we know, falsified that too confident prediction; but a man might have been excused for making it who looked that day on the emaciated septuagenarian, with his face of wax-like pallor, as, preceded by the long array of Cardinals, he passed into the Hall of the Consistory to take part in his first Pontifical act, turning, as he passed, his piercing brown eyes on the silent rows of kneeling spectators, and raising his nervous, trembling hand in benediction.

The Cardinals of 1878.

Of all that long cortège of Eminences, one only survived to attend the next Conclave in 1903—the venerable Cardinal Oreglia di San Stefano, afterwards Bishop of Ostia and Dean of the Sacred College. Comparisons are misleading as well as proverbially odious; but looking at the list of that august College to-day, I hope I may say without disrespect that its members, while doubtless no less able, pious, learned, and sagacious, are as a whole less interesting personalities than their predecessors of fifty years ago.

Assuredly they bear for the most part less distinguished names. One remembers the saintly Cardinal Bonaparte, with his clean-cut features, pale as marble, strangely recalling those of the great Emperor his kinsman: the princely Schwartzberg of Prague, as magnificently generous as he was wealthy: Chigi-Albani, patriarch of Siena and of Rome, and brother of the Prince-Marshal of the Conclave: Borromeo, of the blood of the great Saint Charles, and archpriest of St. Peter's: Ledochowski, of a great Polish house, who had suffered imprisonment for his fidelity to the Holy See;

and genial Donnet, Archbishop of Bordeaux, who once electrified the French Senate, in the course of a debate on the burial laws, by describing how he himself had been laid in his coffin for interment, and had wakened to consciousness as the first screw was being driven into the lid.

English Princes of the Church.

Most interesting of all, to the eyes of some among us, there walked side by side in that procession the two English Eminences, Manning and Howard. A singular contrast they presented—the spare ascetic figure and keen, mobile, parchment-hued countenance of the Cardinal of Westminster, and the tall, burly form, handsome ruddy features and military carriage (it was almost a swing) of the ex-Lifeguardsman. Cardinal Edward Howard (“Ovarde” was the nearest approximation the Romans could reach to the pronunciation of his noble name) had been an especial favourite of Pio Nono, and was so, indeed, with all who knew him. His frank bonhomie, English straightforwardness of character and speech, and genuine kindness of heart, ingratiated him with everyone. He was given to hospitality, and in his pleasant villa in the new quarter of Rome (a district not in favour with the “Papalini”) gave agreeable dinner-parties to which invitations were much sought after.

Cardinal Edward Howard.

His Eminence was an accomplished linguist, and nothing pleased him more than to preside at his table supported, perhaps, on either side by a Greek Patriarch and a Spanish Archbishop, with a French Royalist marquis opposite, and a couple of English monsignori round the corner. After dinner he would enjoy a cigar, and sometimes would insist on all his guests trooping down with him to the stables to view, it might be, a new carriage-horse just arrived from England. Though personally of simple tastes, he kept up rather more state than his Italian colleagues in *Curia*, and his establishment in the Villa Negroni was a considerable one. After the occupation of Rome in 1870 the Cardinals had, by the Pope's wish, abandoned the use of their famous gilt and bedizened coaches, and drove about in lamentable black carriages, drawn as a rule by the sorriest of steeds. Even when taking their walks abroad (the back of the Pincian was their favourite promenade) they were supposed to dispense with all insignia of their rank, and go habited as simple priests.

“Il Gran Cardinale Inglese.”

Cardinal Howard did not pay very much regard to these sumptuary restrictions. He drove out, not, it is true, in a gilded coach, but in a handsome landau from Long Acre; and he never troubled to disguise his identity when taking the air afoot. I have seen him coming home from a visit to some church—perhaps the

stazione of the day; and a notable figure he was, striding along in his red-buttoned cassock and scarlet sash, silver-buckled shoes, and big hat with gold and scarlet tassels. A liveried lackey followed him at respectful distance, bearing his breviary, prayer-books, and other implements of devotion; and the little Romans, as they passed him, would gaze up at "*il gran Cardinale inglese*" with mingled admiration and astonishment. So splendid an apparition had already become rare in the Rome of 1878; and his English Eminence attracted nearly as much attention in the raw, unfinished streets of "*Buzzurropolis*" (as the new quarter of the city had been nicknamed by the people) as he would have done had he taken a noon-day stroll in similar costume from Charing Cross to Ludgate Circus.

Roman Society in the 'Seventies.

There was a unique interest in the great receptions given in those days by the "Black" aristocracy of Rome. Society, of course, became much more mixed in later years, when "blacks" and "whites" (to say nothing of casual visitors from England, America, and elsewhere) mingled indiscriminately at social gatherings. In the 'seventies the life of the patrician Roman families who had remained faithful to Papal traditions was as exclusive and apart as that of the Faubourg St. Germain under the Second Empire. Not a very gay life, to be sure; but they did entertain occasionally, and in very stately fashion, with the scarlet and purple of cardinals and monsignori gleaming among the black or white (no other colours were ever worn) of the ladies and the famous family jewels of the Corsinis and Altieris, the Dorias, Borgheses, Massimos, Bandinis, and Colonnas flashing on the white necks or above the raven tresses of the daughters of Rome.

The Absent Ablegate.

I have one reminiscence of a weird kind connected with one of these receptions. It was held at the Pamphili Palace in the Piazza Navona, in honour of the elevation to the purple of Cardinal Moreno, Archbishop of Valladolid. The central interest of the evening was the anticipated arrival of the Apostolic Ablegate, the high ecclesiastic sent by the Pope to bring the red biretta to the new Cardinal. The appointed hour was long past, but no Ablegate appeared, and messengers were sent across the Tiber to inquire as to the delay. At length the envoy arrived, but not the expected one. The poor man had punctually set forth from the Vatican on his mission, but at the moment of crossing the bridge of St. Angelo had fallen dead in the carriage. The coachman drove back to the Vatican: another Ablegate was hurriedly appointed, and by him the biretta was duly brought and presented to the Spanish prelate.

ABBOT HUNTER BLAIR.

(sometime Privy Chamberlain to H.H. Leo XIII.)

II. TOPICS OF THE MONTH

**Failure of
the Geneva Naval
Conference.**

The actual failure of the Geneva Conference to arrest in any way the enormous and unnecessary waste of financial resources in naval armaments is much less deplorable than the revelation of the spirit in which the question was approached by the three Powers concerned. The actual diplomatists who met at Geneva spoke to the briefs of their naval experts, and these latter, naturally enough, made their suggestions at the dictation of possible war conditions. No Power, not even the scattered British Commonwealth, needs a navy in peace time. There are no pirates nowadays, except perhaps along the indented Chinese coast, and the globe-wide trade routes are as safe in peace time as the English Channel. And in war, only the four other naval Powers—France, Italy, Japan and the United States—could seriously menace British supplies, and war with any of these, singly or in combination, is regarded as unthinkable. The United States, which does not belong to the League of Nations may be excused for not considering it in its deliberations, but why were not its provisions taken into account by the other Powers in their estimate of what they needed for security? And since the thought of the United States as a foe was openly acknowledged by British statesmen to be wholly inadmissible, why did they not go further and say to the States—“Build as many ships as your tax-payers will allow you: we shall not reckon them as a possible menace to our communications: we shall fix our requirements as if they did not exist.” That would be to translate words into deeds—and we do not believe that American common sense in face of that attitude would worry about parity or prestige. But once the naval experts began to insist on their requirements and to advance excellent reasons in support, the other parties began to find out reasons to justify their naval programmes, and rivalry, instead of co-operation, followed. The Geneva fiasco was inevitable as soon as it became evident that the Powers engaged were aiming, not at the elimination of naval warfare but at seeking naval security against one another. It would be easy by a one-sided consideration of the arguments to make out a case either for Great Britain or America,—Japan throughout showed a genuine desire for reduction and was willing to fall in with any proposal that secured it;—the Commonwealth needs many small cruisers because of its world-wide extent, the Republic needs large cruisers because it has few naval bases. We are not disposed to blame either party for holding to their respective views but rather to blame both for missing the whole aim and object of the Conference—the making of peace more secure by making aggression less possible.

In the scathing words of *The Times* (July 23rd), “It is

quite intolerable that a Conference summoned for the purpose of strengthening the foundations of peace should evoke visions of immense rivalries at sea, of possible wars, of conflicts of which no one has even really dreamed."

**Want of
Real Will for
Peace.**

The desire of peace seems to be steadily disappearing from the councils of the nations, and it will evaporate altogether unless the various peoples wake up to the danger and take every means to avert it. The shrieks of derision which went up from the militarists of the Continent at the failure of the two great peace-loving "Anglo-Saxon" nations to reduce their navies, on account of their mutual jealousy and mistrust, were not pleasant to hear. Their inability even to declare a naval holiday and save many millions of pounds simply by ceasing for a time to compete against one another, shows how completely they are in the grip of "navy leagues" and armament manufacturers, and how little reliance they place in practice on the elaborate arrangement for security contained in the Covenant of the League. Fear still dominates their minds, a relief from fear is sought in national strength, not in combination to prevent the abuse of national strength. It is a strange commentary on human wisdom that, whereas complete security against naval aggression would result from the total abolition of naval forces, and a greater degree of security from every progressive reduction, our leaders aim at safety in precisely the opposite way. It should be plain that no nation can find security in its own material force, unless all the others agree to permit its supremacy in arms over them all. We do not believe that either the British or American disputants are "navalists" in their aims, consciously fighting for dominance at sea, but we do complain that they have failed in vision and are still the victims of pre-war illusions. The Conference is, officially, only postponed: still its resumption would be a questionable benefit, unless it acquires meanwhile quite a different outlook. We trust that in future sessions it may recover something of the Locarno spirit, in the influence of which age-long foes decided to fight no more and then arranged their mutual relations under guidance of that determination. We are told that two professors of Columbia University have drawn up, on the model of Locarno, a treaty outlawing war and substituting conciliation and arbitration, an answer, it may be, to M. Briand's sensible proposal that America and France should so agree. That politicians are slow to work for this consummation, so desirable from every standpoint, material and spiritual, indicates the enormous weight which the financial and professional interests involved in war preparations still carry in national policy. Japan, which alone came away from Geneva with credit, made the eminently practical proposal that America, Britain

and herself should agree to safeguard each other's commerce in their own areas. Some such pooling of resources would make enormously for economy and security both. But it could be safely attempted only when war between those Powers was finally and definitely ruled out.

**Canada as
an Inspirer of
Peace.**

The disappointment due to the abortive discussions at Geneva was to some extent counteracted a little later by the formal opening of the "Peace" Bridge between America and Canada some twenty miles above the Niagara Falls, an occasion on which the Vice-President of the States met the Prince of Wales and the British and Canadian Prime Ministers, and speeches were made expressive of the friendliness and the pacific outlook both of Republic and Commonwealth. Canada is celebrating this year the Diamond Jubilee of her establishment as a self-governing Confederation, an event which in its time helped to break down the old idea of "Empire" and which has resulted in exhibiting, to the astonished Old World, the possibility of two large and independent States existing side by side without provision for defence against each other. The "Peace" Bridge is in harmony with the undefended frontier, and together they emphasize the fact that international intercourse may be maintained for generations without the use of war as an instrument of policy. The States have twelve times the population of the Dominion, a proportion which is not likely to decrease for many decades, yet there has never been a disposition in the larger community to conquer and absorb the smaller. Moreover, their mutual harmony cannot be explained by unity of race, or speech, or religion. The States reproduce the racial elements and beliefs of Europe, Africa and Asia, whilst a large and progressive minority in Canada consists of Catholic French and Irish. In fact, the composition of both peoples has ruled out several of the causes of war in the past—religion, dynastic ambitions, traditional ill-will and irredentism. Each, moreover, has a territory too vast to lead it to covet the lands of the other. Hence there has been time for the growth of a mentality in both, alien to the idea of war as a means of self-assertion, and part of our assurance that war between Britain and America is unthinkable is based upon the traditional friendship between America and Canada.

**Damage
done
by Pessimists.**

The danger of such a set-back to peace as happened at the Geneva Conference is that it shakes people's faith in the possibility of real disarmament. The pessimists are confirmed in their pessimism and the optimists tend to become dubious. Listen to an eminent specimen of the former class, Lord Birkenhead, speaking at the Pilgrims' Club to a party of American editors :—

It is easy to say that war is barbarous, cruel and stupid, and ought to be stopped; but how many of us believe that in fact it can be abolished? I enter a most earnest *caveat* lest it should be supposed that either human nature or international human nature has greatly changed. It has not.

But surely as human nature has changed in the course of history or, more accurately, has been brought more under control of morality, why should the process stop? Why, indeed, should it not be accelerated under the stimulus of our late experience of war? Lord Birkenhead has, before this, spoken as a materialist and we can expect nothing better from him, but we had thought that the Labour Party, at any rate, consistently put forward peace as their policy. Yet the other day Lord Thomson, Minister for Air in the late Labour Government, speaking of the horrible possibilities of widespread devastation due to the development of war-planes, came to "the melancholy conclusion" that the only way to avert these possibilities was to be in a position to inflict the like on the enemy and urged his audience to qualify as pilots in readiness for "the next war." We may hope that this naked advocacy of the crude and futile policy of armament competition may keep the speaker from office in the next Labour ministry, but, coming from such a source, it is significant of a growing reaction from the policy of "preparing peace." A policy of drift in this matter is fatal: the world, unenlightened, inexperienced, drifted into the war of 1914, which nearly destroyed one whole generation and impoverished the Old World and which has burdened the present generation with painful problems difficult of solution. We need be under no delusion as to the character of that next war of which the foolish and thoughtless talk so glibly. The one weapon of aircraft which can destroy whole cities and cannot discriminate in its massacre, the power of poisoning, not only air, but water and food, the entire absence of any regard for humane conventions which the late war has permanently introduced into armed conflict—it is to these terrors that the war-mongers—and in the circumstances all those are making for war who are not striving for peace—would callously expose us. It is for Catholics, who are taught sound ethics on the nature and causes of war, to take this opportunity of proclaiming and propagating their knowledge.

Preparations for War.

Any extravagance may be expected to occur in the free and experimental atmosphere of the States, and so we note¹ with disgust, but without surprise, that an American journal called *The World's Work* published some months ago a "Next War Number," wherein a prominent U.S. admiral demonstrated "How We Shall Lose the Next War"—apparently by allowing the Navy

¹ See *The Commonwealth*, Aug. 18, p. 333.

to be limited. Of greater and more sinister significance than this naval demonstration, is the publication in Germany of secret armament plans, which has been the occasion of diplomatic Notes between Belgium and that country and which, therefore, though generally ignored by the German Press, must have a certain degree of authenticity.¹ Briefly, it is a repetition, with differences, of the plan by which Prussia after Tilsit managed to evade Napoleon's limitation of its army to 48,000—the introduction of short but intensive service, so that a large number of trained men who had passed through the Army were always available. The modern Reichwehr, which is almost wholly monarchist, does not want conscription of all classes, but aims at having a three-years service army of one political complexion with a nine-years reserve, so that, while keeping to the Treaty level of 100,000, the actual war-strength would in a few years reach 460,000 men. With this material, according to the Reichwehr plans, Poland could again be conquered and the old dream of "Deutschland ueber Alles" be gradually realized. These militarists take for granted that the efforts of the League of Nations to secure European disarmament will fail, and so give Germany a moral right to rearm herself according to her needs. We have all along pointed out, as a reason for speedy general disarmament that, unless Part V. of the Versailles Treaty which makes German disarmament the first and necessary condition for a universal limitation, is not completely carried out, Germany may justly claim freedom from the restrictions therein imposed. In any case, if the other nations fail to reduce their forces she certainly will make that claim. The revelation of these secret plans and of the mentality that inspires them should stimulate the League Disarmament Conference to renewed activity.

**Lessons
of the War
Unheeded.**

These revelations have naturally had an unfortunate effect upon the French mind, ever prone to distrust Germany and to fear her recovery of military strength. French soldiers think and speak as if the Locarno Treaty, definitely renouncing war between the two nations, did not exist. The French Minister of War stressed, in a speech on August 14th, the necessity of being ready against possible aggression. French military writers point, with some reason, to the steady growth of German expenditure on Army and Navy as proving the formation of hidden reserves. Hence the strong reluctance of the French military men to terminate or mitigate the occupation of the Rhine, as if it were their sole security against attack. In spite of Versailles and the disarming of the ex-enemy States, the war-budget of Europe reaches 450 million pounds—as much as in 1913—and there are a million more men under arms. Yet to take the British forces alone, 807,451 men

¹ A full exposition of the plans may be seen in *The Review of Reviews*, Aug.-Sept. 1927, p. 133.

were killed in the war to end war, 64,907 were lost, 2,059,134 were wounded. There are still 19,900 of these wounded still under treatment: there are 154,000 war widows, 265,000 war orphans and 750,000 unemployed ex-soldiers. But so bankrupt are statesmen of political wisdom, so apathetic are even those who lost health, fortune and happiness through the war, that press and platform and cabinet are more occupied with military preparations than with constructive endeavours for peace. A passage in some recent Fascist Party Orders maintains, with no shadow of regret, that "the spirit of Locarno is evaporating with impressive rapidity. Soon nothing will remain but the faded label . . . the whole of Europe is furiously arming." The attitude of Italy under its present regime, like the attitude of Bolshevik Russia—both opposed to the League of Nations—is partly responsible for this reversion to barbarism, but the main fault is that of the Powers which could have most influence in the League and yet refuse to strengthen and make perfect that, the world's only, bulwark against war.

**Neglect
to use the
League.**

The League is not perfect, even in conception: some nations, notably the United States, have not joined it: others like Spain and Brazil have, unwisely, left it. The Big Four show a tendency to revert to the old secret diplomacy and work outside it. Unless a determined and sustained effort is put forth by those concerned, there is a distinct danger that this, the sole substantial gain which humanity reaped from four years' colossal sacrifice of life and treasure, will gradually or speedily perish from inanition. It is surely the height of folly to set up and maintain at great expense this vast and elaborate structure, calculated, if habitually and wisely used, to solve with some measure of satisfaction every international dispute, and then to conduct international business, to make treaties and alliances, to construct military and naval budgets, to manufacture and traffic in armaments, as if there was no such thing in existence. Sir Austen Chamberlain, who professes himself a devotee of the League ideal and who certainly has devoted much personal attention to its business, constantly excuses its inactivity by the plea that it is young and should not be overburdened. But it is not its external action that is chiefly called in question, but rather the method of its internal working. M. de Jouvenel, the most influential and active of the French delegation to the Assembly, recently resigned his post on the grounds that, with the connivance of the French Government, much business which should properly have been transacted through the League was being dealt with elsewhere. Especially does he regret that the smaller Powers, which hitherto had looked to France for support and sympathy, have not received it. Whatever be the justice of this complaint, it indicates that one observer, closely acquainted with the workings of the League, has detected a tendency to abandon it in favour of

the diplomatic usages which, if they did not produce, at least failed to prevent, the Great War.

Peace Efforts.

Against all these alarming signs we have certain indications of progress towards peace to record. On July 9th, at Luxembourg, for the first time since the war, the "International Federation of ex-Service Men" (called from its initials in French, F.I.D.A.C.) admitted ex-enemies to its annual gathering. The German delegation represented the "Reichsbanner" (a very large organization embracing ex-Service Men and Young Republicans) and those who have most cause to detest war, viz., the German Disabled Society and Prisoners of War Association. There was a similar delegation from Austria. Part of the final resolution ran as follows: "The Conference invites ex-Service men . . . to teach the rising generation that he who loves his country ought to apply himself to the maintenance of honourable peace between nations." A clause enjoining respect for treaties was not consented to by the Germans until it was pointed out that there could be no objection to modifications of the Versailles Treaty, provided they were carried out constitutionally. The British Legion took a leading part in this Conference, which is of happy augury for the future. Moreover, the meeting at Cologne last July of Christian democratic organizations brought together representatives of France, Holland, Belgium, Lithuania, Czechoslovakia and Italy to discuss with delegates of the Centre party the improvement of relations between France and Germany. It was then made clear that the Centre was heart and soul with the Locarno policy and the maintenance of the Republic. And recently there has been concluded a Franco-German commercial agreement, based on a recognition of common interests, which will tend to enlist financial interests in the cause of peace. It is too early to forecast the effect of the Seventh International Democratic Congress for Peace which meets at Wurtzburg early this month to consider the existing risks of war and to continue the campaign for peace. The failure of the various national governments to secure what is the highest good for their subjects makes it imperative that those subjects themselves should, in organizations of this kind, undertake the task of promoting international reconciliation. Our only regret is that they can meet but seldom whereas war-propaganda through the press is incessant. Even the League of Nations Union in this country, which claims a membership of 630,800 individuals, besides an affiliation of 2,341 corporate members, has little effect in restraining the spirit of belligerency on which the sensational press is wont to feed. However, although what the Christian advocate of peace is attempting to do is to change the traditional mentality of a de-Christianized race, it ill beseems him to fall into despair. His work is to restore Christianity, and his strength is not his own.

The
Sacco-Vanzetti
Case.

One is reminded by the cosmopolitan agitation aroused by the Sacco-Vanzetti case of the somewhat similar ebullitions which occurred when the Spanish anarchist, Ferrer, was executed for rebellion in October, 1909. There was the same outburst of rioting in the great cities, the same attacks on the representatives of the Government responsible. But, as Mr. Belloc pointed out in an instructive C.T.S. pamphlet, "The Ferrer Case," the protests on the earlier occasion were engineered by international Freemasonry, of which brotherhood Ferrer was a high official, were really directed against the Catholic Church of which he was a venomous opponent, and ceased abruptly when his real character and conduct became known. The feelings excited by this latter case, on the other hand, were not confined to Communists and anarchists, bent on making martyrs of their kin, but extended to many who have nothing but detestation for the class-war. The various Labour protests were doubtless inspired by that unhappy preoccupation, but many were anxious to disclaim any sympathy with the crime of which the two anarchists had been found guilty: they based their appeals on the assumption that, if a delay of seven years between the sentence and its proposed execution was possible, the verdict itself could only be doubtful. Thus, the protest, in effect, was against the inherent imperfection or the mal-administration of American criminal law, which allows the possibility of endless delays on technical or frivolous grounds in the carrying out even of a just sentence. Public sympathy was stirred, moreover, by the thought of men passing seven long years in such suspense, such harrowing uncertainty being considered a cruel aggravation of their sentence. This view, of course, assumes that they were really innocent: if guilty, they gained what many condemned murderers would be glad to gain—a considerable prolongation of lives rightly forfeited. We have, of course, no means of ascertaining the truth: the evidence was circumstantial and cumulative. However, the Governor of Massachusetts, who had the best opportunity of knowing, was convinced of their guilt and showed the strength of his convictions by the staunchness with which he withstood an unprecedented domestic and world-wide clamour. When that took the shape of violence, it may be that any tendency to exercise the prerogative of mercy became stifled. If anarchy can succeed in terrorizing the representatives of the law, then it will have established its own reign. As things were, the anarchists themselves by their engineered outrages may only have sealed the fate of their comrades.

The constitutionalist will note the express recognition of the absolute judicial authority of the State, involved in the refusal of members of the Federal Supreme Court to interfere with the jurisdiction of Massachusetts:

**Republicans
and the Oath of
Allegiance.**

We have here no concern with Irish politics, but we have with Irish morals; as with morals everywhere. On that account, the action of Mr. de Valera and his followers in taking the Oath of Allegiance embodied in the Free State Constitution, whilst protesting that they consider it "an empty formality," has filled us with distress. We do not question their *bona fides*: they have somehow persuaded themselves, or been persuaded, that by so acting they ran no risk of perjury. They may have argued that, since the formula to which they swore contains no attestation of the Deity, it does not really constitute an oath, but is at most a solemn promise. Still, that promise was made, as is always customary, on the Testament, and, in any case, where is the honesty in making a solemn promise, which must necessarily be genuine if the acts dependent on it are to be legally valid, saying the while you don't really mean it? The oath is what it always was: yet for five years it was considered an insuperable obstacle to entering the Dail, and now it is regarded as so obnoxious that every effort must be made to secure its abolition. On what possible grounds then can it be regarded as an "empty formality"? We are glad to record that, before this scandalous step was taken, a Dublin priest protested against the ignorance of ethics or the indifference to perjury, which it would involve, for, indeed, no well-instructed Catholic could justify it. All agree—and the Hierarchy openly deplore the fact—that the fierce party warfare that has distracted Ireland since the Treaty was signed has been responsible for a wide-spread blurring of moral issues, and we fear that this very ill-advised action on the part of the Republicans will only add to the moral confusion, unless it is speedily and authoritatively denounced.

**The Irish
Bill Against Bad
Literature.**

In common with all who love good literature, we have to lament one accidental effect of the wicked murder of Mr. O'Higgins and the consequent weakening of the Irish Government, viz., the almost inevitable postponement till next year of the promised Bill for restricting, as far as possible, the importation and circulation of bad books and papers. The recent Synod at Maynooth is said to have had the matter under consideration, and it is hardly possible that the Bill, which is the outcome of a Government Commission on the subject, will not be proceeded with when opportunity occurs. The plague is vast and growing: it is calculated that the Irish people spend about £500,000 a year in importing literature from England, the bulk of which is pagan and secular in outlook whilst much of it is positively immoral. Nor must we seem to deny that a small clique of writers in Ireland itself has for some time been specializing in foul literature to the scandal

of their countrymen. The works of Joyce and O'Flaherty will, let us hope, be the first to be banished by the Bill from public currency. A healthy public opinion would have banished them long ago, and it is this which is so difficult to create and to maintain. Not by any means alone in Ireland. Literary licence finds very little check in this country or in the States, whilst in France it seems to find none. Even Catholics of note, men and women, in that country, we learn from *Documentation Catholique* (July 30th), have come forward in defence of an evil romance concerning St. Joan of Arc, which was rightly denounced by a Catholic critic. The latter, naturally, sees in this condonation of evil "la décadence profonde de la critique, et plus particulièrement de la critique catholique." It would appear from *La Vie Catholique* that the same moral cowardice, exhibited in another direction, has tended to the prolongation of the "Action Française" scandal. Many Catholic papers have been afraid to support and defend the Pope's just action in this matter, and thus left their readers without the guidance they have a right to expect.

The
Uncertain Trumpet-
note.

A refreshing note of reality was introduced into the domestic controversy about the Revised Anglican Prayer Book by Mr. Ronald McNeill who wrote to *The Times* on July 27th endorsing Lord Hugh Cecil's statement that the dispute is at cross purposes because "we are clearly not agreed as to what is the doctrinal basis of the Old Book . . . and it is obvious that we cannot intelligently dispute until we have first determined what that doctrine is." Mr. McNeill claims to have urged the same argument "as long ago as March 16th" when he pleaded in *The Times* for "an authoritative declaration of what the doctrine of the Church is in regard to what appears to be the central point of the controversy," viz., whether after consecration the sacramental elements do, or do not, remain the same in all respects as before. Mr. McNeill has forgotten apparently, that as long ago as October, 1898, Archbishop Temple of Canterbury assured his flock that "the Church of England has not answered that question." Nor has she answered it since, for the Bishop of Norwich boasted (shall we say?) in a sermon reported on February 13th that "the Church of England does not give definitions on the Sacrament of Holy Communion nor urge special theories." Many anxious minds have asked that question which Mr. McNeill rightly regards as "the central point of the controversy" and, getting no answer, have sought one in a Church, conscious of her commission to teach. Perhaps if he will only wait a bit his doubts about the teaching of his Church will be laid by the publication of the findings of a "Commission on Doctrinal Unity" appointed in 1923 by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, which makes a transient appearance in the Press every year about this time, to let us know

it is still at work, and the reference of which is couched in these hopeful words :—" To consider the nature and grounds of Christian doctrine with a view to demonstrating the extent of existing agreement within the Church of England and with a view to investigating how far it is possible to remove or diminish existing differences." Pending that report and supposing the Prayer Book is approved by Parliament in the meantime, Mr. McNeill must run the risk of finding that his belief, which he has apparently arrived at independently of his Church, is out of harmony with that of the parson whose service he attends.¹

Is
Doctrinal Unity
Desirable?

In considering the attempt of non-Catholics to return to the ideal of Catholic unity, of which something has been said in this issue, it must be remembered that not a few of the sects, or at any rate some of the sectarians, do not agree that unity is really desirable. As we showed in our April issue² the Editor of *The Green Quarterly*, an " Anglo-Catholic " periodical, (see issues for Spring and Summer) thinks that the Anglican body ought rather to glory in its divisions, an idea shared by a writer at the opposite pole, the modernist Bishop of Durham, who says, " Let us not forget that the doctrinal basis of the Church of England supposes different conceptions and that some Anglicans passionately uphold what others repudiate with equal energy. How could the Church of England exercise her spirit of comprehension, so rightly valued, if profound disagreements did not exist amongst her members. It is the duty of us bishops to maintain this characteristic of our Church." It must be owned that few of them fail in this duty. But what a light do these views, existing within one comparatively narrow sect, throw on the courage of those who conceived the idea of Lausanne! They are, of course, even more rife in Nonconformity, and the Gallios of the street hold them almost unconsciously. Here is one of them, speaking for his fellows, in the *Liverpool Morning Post* (July 12th) :—

Is Christian unity feasible? It is, as we have said, a great ideal, and a wonderful thing if it could be attained. But nearly each individual among us approaches truth in different ways, and a Church is a congregation of individuals who, broadly, see truth from a similar angle. A Church, in other words, is a point of view organized. It is this identity of view that gives a Church its driving force. We cannot eradicate this indivi-

¹ In this connection we must apologize for having, in a note on the results of the Prayer Book Controversy last month (p. 165), mentioned " The League of Loyalty and Order " as being opposed to the Revised Book whereas it supports it. It was the " Committee for the Maintenance of Truth and Faith " that we should have mentioned as hostile to the Book.

² " The Opinions of Anglicanism," illustrated by the Prayer Book Controversy.

dualism even if we would. It is important, indeed, to keep it alive and vigorous. For, after all, a disunity that arises out of individual spiritual conviction may be, and often is, a potent religious force. The evil of disunity arises from active antagonisms between Churches.

We may note that the conception of a Church divinely instituted for all mankind, and teaching revealed truth with God's authority does not even occur to the writer. So completely has the modern mind rejected institutional Christianity. A Church is a point of view organized! It is to minds like these that the dubious "message" of Lausanne will be directed.

The Crown, Sole Source of Anglican Jurisdiction. The most potent influence making for the acceptance of the Revised Prayer Book is undoubtedly the fear of Disestablishment. By dint of the Royal Supremacy, Anglicanism retains the only form of unity open to it: dissolve that bond, and the religious world would number half-a-dozen new and struggling sects with but few active adherents. But failing the supremacy of the Pope, the supremacy of the King furnishes a poor shadow of a substitute and maintains a sort of external unity. We need not contrast in detail the effect of these two supremacies, the Divine and the human, the one producing unity, certainty and peace, the other, doubt, division and discord. But we may recall how completely human that of the monarch is and how utterly void spiritually is any jurisdiction that flows from it. Whenever the monarch exercises his prerogative, the Bishop elect (appointed, in other words, on the recommendation of the Prime Minister at the time) is presented to the King by the Home Secretary and then, on his knees, after kissing the Bible, he says:—

I — Doctor of Divinity, now elected, confirmed and consecrated Bishop of —, do hereby declare that your Majesty is the only Supreme Governor of this our realm in spiritual and ecclesiastical things, as well as in temporal, and that no foreign prelate or potentate has any jurisdiction within this realm; and I acknowledge that I hold the said Bishopric, as well the spiritualities as the temporalities thereof, only of Your Majesty. And for the same temporalities I do my homage presently to your Majesty—so help me God. God save the King.¹

There is an unmistakable Elizabethan thoroughness and clearness about this oath-confirmed declaration which cuts away all pretence at continuity in spiritual things with the Apostles. Elizabeth knew she could "unrock" Bishops as readily as she made them, and she had this declaration on which to rest her claim. When Lord John Russell published it in *The Times* on March 5, 1875, it

¹ See, with appropriate comments, Allies' "Per Crucem ad Lucem," p. 7.

came as a great shock to the Ritualists of those days, then under the first terrors of the Public Worship Act. It has since been largely lost sight of, to the detriment of sincerity in controversy.

Catholic Congresses.

Just before the Unity Conference at Lausanne there was held another Congress for unity—the International Congress for the Reunion of the Eastern Churches—at Velehrad, in Czechoslovakia, which meets annually with increasing fruit. Before the war, the Hungarian Government used to suppress any publicly organized devotion to the great Slav saints, SS. Cyril and Methodius. Now there is no such restriction and, as the Congress coincided with the celebrations in honour of the eleventh centenary of the birth of St. Cyril, nearly two hundred and fifty ecclesiastics both from East and West assembled for the occasion. We are glad to note that a clear and accurate statement of the character and position of Anglicanism, in regard both to Rome and the near East, was laid before the Congress by a well-informed lady of Slav extraction, Miss A. Christitch. Nearer home and contemporaneously with Lausanne the Cambridge School of Higher Studies were discussing, but in how different a manner, the same subject—The Church—as entered into the programme of the larger Conference. The Cambridge papers were reported in outline in our Catholic journals, and they give one the opportunity of contrasting the speculations of those who, 2,000 years after the foundation of Christianity, are trying to find out what it means, with the certainties of those who know. Significantly enough, immediately after the Lausanne meeting, the first Swiss National Eucharistic Congress was held at Einsiedeln, the little town which lies around the great Benedictine monastery between the lakes of Lucerne and Zurich. Here, of course, there was perfect unity of faith and worship, based on revelation infallibly transmitted.

Ignorance of the Ethics of Temperance.

We spoke in July of some Catholics being so ill-instructed in morals as to seem to reckon total abstinence from strong drink, commended as it is by our spiritual leaders and writers on ascetics, as in some sort an offence against moderation. Our lively and well-informed contemporary, *The Universe*, the recent growth of whose circulation is unique in Catholic journalism, doubted the possibility of such curious Catholics existing, but a few weeks later in another Catholic journal a letter appeared which quite explicitly established our view. The writer, after finding fault, somewhat impertinently, with the entire German hierarchy for exhorting their flocks to stem the growing tide of drunkenness around them by setting an example of self-control by total abstinence, went on in his wisdom to say, "Total abstinence, which is intemperance just as drunkenness is, is not a tenet of the Catholic

Church." The ignorance displayed in the use of the word *tenet* in that connection is as nothing compared to the blatant error expressed in the relative clause. We have noticed other letters in the same sense in our Catholic papers, provoked, no doubt, by the errors of the prohibitionist, but as uninformed of the ethics of temperance as he is.

**Short Views
of
Eugenists.**

Modern paganism, masquerading as humanitarianism, inspires many of the beliefs and recommendations of the Eugenics Society. A wholly material outlook colours, for instance, many of the arguments in Professor Pearson's recent book, "On the Right of the Unborn Child." The "right" that interests the professor is the right to a physically healthy existence, whereas reason itself suggests that, in the case of a being destined to eternal happiness, it is better to be born diseased than not to be born at all: better for the individual, that is, not necessarily for the society in which he finds himself, although he provides that society with occasion to manifest many high virtues. The materialist, who thinks only of this world and this life must logically postulate for the unborn as his "right," not only the one boon of physical health, but also whatever other gifts and qualities, internal and external, as are needed to make existence pleasurable. On the other hand, we must hold that all people in their use of the progenitive faculties should be guided by prudence. Christian morality cannot approve of reckless multiplication of offspring, unfitted to lead a normal life or too numerous to find subsistence. We yield to no pagans in our insistence on prudence, but we do not advocate it on wrong grounds. A child has no rights, because it has no existence, until it is conceived, and then its chief right, to achieve which all else may well be sacrificed, is the right to a happy eternity.

**The
Membership of
the C.T.S.**

The approach of the Centenary of Catholic Emancipation has suggested to the authorities of the C.T.S. the advisability of making a supreme effort to bring its membership up to the level suggested as desirable and feasible at the beginning of the Forward Movement six or seven years ago, viz., a figure of 30,000. Two years or so ago the membership had reached over half that total—a prodigious result, all things considered, in the time; but not a few of those members proved to be "dead," or, more expressively, "duds," and now the actually paying total centres about 12,000, with a slight tendency to decrease. This should not be: quite apart from the approaching centenary, the membership should be retained and increased. At the last annual meeting, the President, H.E. Cardinal Bourne, assured the Catholic body "that there is now a greater need than ever for the work of the Society." The

very friendly but outspoken statement in our last issue, concerning the amount it falls short, in the matter of available literature, of the ideal—a statement which we have reason to know the authorities look upon as a stimulus and a help—was rather a criticism of the Catholic public itself than of the Society, for its output must be governed by its available funds and it works right up to their limit. The ideal which Fr. Martindale sketched in our August number has the advantage of being exceedingly practical, if only the apostolic spirit grows, as it should, amongst the faithful. The forces of evil never seem to lack funds to propagate error: they are doubtless richer in this world's goods, but that they should be richer in zeal would be a strange paradox indeed. If the C.T.S. had existed in 1829, how eagerly our ancestors would have used it to vindicate their faith! It behoves us all, clergy and flocks, to avail ourselves of the weapons, so bountifully supplied us by the C.T.S., in our campaign for the conversion of our country which is the best and most obvious way of showing our gratitude for the gift of faith. A twopenny pamphlet is a small and feeble thing: so was David's smooth pebble from the brook. Let us see that our Davids do not lack pebbles.

**Free Copies
of
"The Month."**

Not infrequently we get pathetic appeals from lonely workers in the far-flung mission-fields for free copies of our periodical—appeals which might seem flattering, but for the reflection that in such circumstances any reading matter must needs be welcome. It is painful to have to refuse these requests, since to the individual the desired service may well seem small. But the effect here is cumulative and already the burden of free copies is a weighty one; we gain, it is true, a wider circulation, but not an increase of solvency. We should be more than rewarded by the prayerful gratitude of our various beneficiaries, but our printers have not yet been trained to prefer prayers to cash. However, we are sure that the various missionary societies are glad of periodical literature for the use of missionaries, or, at least, are prepared to give the names and addresses of priests on the missions who desire a particular magazine or paper. Subscribers, therefore, who do not file or otherwise dispose of their MONTHS, may be assured that there is a steady demand for them in those quarters and that they would be doing a real act of charity if, under the guidance of the A.P.A., they sent them to the missions.

THE EDITOR.

III. NOTES ON THE PRESS

[A summary survey of current periodicals with a view to recording useful articles which 1) expound Catholic doctrine and practice, 2) expose heresy and bigotry, and 3) are of general Catholic interest.]

CATHOLIC DOCTRINE AND PRACTICE.

Creed, The, really Apostolic [Archbishop MacDonald in *Tablet*, July 16, 1927, p. 74].

CATHOLIC DEFENCE.

Anglican Church History corrected [Rev. W. A. Spence in *Month*, Sept., 1927, p. 249; Rev. H. E. G. Rope, *ibid.* p. 217].

Anglican Orders, how "recognition" by Orthodox was brought about [Bishop Kean in *Tablet*, August 16, 1927, p. 166, 169].

Atheist Propaganda in U.S.A. Schools [J. McGuire, S.J., in *Fortnightly Review* (St. Louis), July 15, 1927, p. 287].

Bigotry, The Survival of [D. B. Wyndham Lewis in *Catholic Times*, July 22, 1927, p. 11].

Catholicism in Scotland: Col. Buchan's historical misreading [*Universe*, July 22, 1927, p. 12].

Continuity at York: Archbishop Long's suppressions of truth [*Tablet*, July 9, 1927, p. 41].

French Catholic Schoolmistresses oppose laicism: "les Davidées" [*Catholic Bulletin*, August, 1927, p. 836].

Great Schism did not destroy Papal Jurisdiction in England [*Tablet*, in reply to *Guardian*, July 23, 1927, p. 105].

Slanders about Spain's Religion refuted [*Tablet*, July 16, 1927, p. 71].

POINTS OF CATHOLIC INTEREST.

Baker, Miss Annie, and her work [Miss M. Fletcher in *Catholic Women's Outlook*, July, 1927, p. 31].

Benedict XV's Peace Efforts: Evil effects of rejection [*Catholic Times*, August 19, 1927, p. 7].

Canada's Diamond Jubilee [M. Grattan O'Leary in *Commonweal*, July 27, 1927, p. 294].

Catholic enemies of Peace, and of the League of Nations, exposed [Y. de la Brière in *Etudes*, August 5, 1927, p. 339].

Catholic Industrial Policy should aim at peace [H. Somerville in *Catholic Times*, July 15, 1927, p. 11].

Catholics, Civil rights and duties of [Don Luigi Sturzo and others in *Bulletin Catholique International*, July-August, 1927 p. 1].

Democracy as taught by Bellarmine and Catholic Theologians generally [J. Husslein, S.J., in *America*, July 5, 1927, p. 272].

Devil-worship in India [D. A. Lord, S.J., in *The Queen's Work*, August, 1927, p. 203].

Host, Looking upon the, at Elevation [Dom D. Goetz, O.S.B., in *Chimes*, April-June, 1927, p. 75].

Just Price, The, Hopes of return to [*Catholic Times*, August 6, 1927, p. 12].

Louvain, The Quincentenary of [Articles in *Revue des Questions Scientifiques*, July 20, 1927: J. Van Ginneken in *Studiën*, August, 1927, p. 81].

Mexico, The Tragedy of [W. Parsons in *America*, June 25, 1927].

Over-Population Bogey exposed [*Catholic Times*, July 22, 1927 p. 12: H. Somerville in *Month*, Sept., 1927, p. 202].

Poland, The Importance of [G. K. Chesterton in *America*, June 25, 1927, p. 253].

REVIEWS

I—DESIDERIUS ERASMUS¹

DR. J. J. Mangan's *Life of Erasmus*, of which mention has already been made more than once in these pages, is a very painstaking and important study of the great humanist. On the whole we are inclined to think that the biographer deals more tenderly with Erasmus than that scholar quite deserves. As a medical man Dr. Mangan diagnoses in his subject a neurasthenia which was a handicap to him all through life. It is not always easy to be sympathetic with neurasthenics. They seem to have energy enough to throw themselves into every form of amusement and to be willing to spend their strength on work which is at the moment congenial or which makes them conspicuous and flatters their vanity, but the instant that anything is recognized as a task, then they are bent on procuring an exemption, leaving the burden to those who are willing to face it. What is more they are apt to be highly sensitive. Every contradiction they meet, every act which seems lacking in consideration or which implies difference of opinion is bitterly resented, while in their querulous moods they are reckless of other people's feelings and are wont to be absolutely unmeasured in their invective and unconscionable in the demands which they make upon their friends. All this was certainly true of Erasmus, and it is in no way surprising that some of his critics have found it difficult to recognize one single amiable trait in his character.

Dr. Mangan has not by any means been blind to these shortcomings. He sets out the facts conscientiously and he makes no attempt to minimize the scandal which the biting satire of such writings as the "Colloquies" and "The Praise of Folly," were bound to cause in a state of society which was already seething with the disaffection which came to a head in Luther's revolt. Our author is no doubt successful in vindicating the substantial sincerity of the humanist's attachment to the cause of Catholicism. But he was never a conspicuously loyal son of the Church. The personality of Erasmus everywhere came first, and the defence of the Faith was a very bad second. It seems to us that there was something strangely and insidiously cancerous about the classical scholarship of that age and for more than a century afterwards. No prominent humanist could write

¹ *The Life, Character and Influence of Desiderius Erasmus of Rotterdam.* By John Joseph Mangan, A.M., M.D. New York: The Macmillan Co. 2 Vols. Pp. xvi. 404, 428. Illustrated. 1926.

a natural and sincere letter. He was always thinking of the turn of his phrases and of how his epistle would look in print, and of how his elegant Latinity would impress his correspondent or a still larger circle of readers. We believe that this form of vanity had the very worst effect upon character, rendering the man of letters always self-conscious and to a large extent insincere. Even such a man as Blessed Sir Thomas More is never seen to less advantage than in his early Latin effusions. And this reminds us that while Dr. Mangan has provided an excellent bibliography and has evidently been diligent in studying the literature of his subject, he has apparently overlooked the very valuable and suggestive Lives of More and Fisher by Father T. E. Bridgett. Still he has given us in this biography a satisfactory piece of work, and though perhaps there is a certain lack of ease and idiomatic elegance in the composition no future student of the works of Erasmus can afford to neglect it.

2—ANGLICAN MORAL THEOLOGY¹

THAT any Protestant should with approval even whisper the word "casuistry" is an event. The term has long been an opprobrious synonym for Catholic Moral Theology, and, indeed, for Protestants, might be said to be its epitaph. But the Reverend Kenneth E. Kirk has read widely, and to all appearance deeply, in Catholic Moral Theology, and knows well, as do all those Ministers of the Established Church who hear confessions, that a science of casuistry is indispensable in dealing with consciences. The author has made the acquaintance of the Corpus Juris Canonici, the Codex Juris, Denzinger, Diana, Concina, and even Caramuel; also, of course, of St. Thomas Aquinas, St. Alphonsus Liguori, and the moderns, as Lehmkuhl, Fr. Slater, Prümmer, Ferreres. This is not the first attempt made by Mr. Kirk to supply what the Lambeth Conference of 1920 pointed out was lacking, and wanted in the equipment of the Anglican clergy—a systematic knowledge of moral theology. In December, 1920, we had occasion to review with some severity his *Some Principles of Moral Theology and their Application*. The present work, we are glad to say, does not deserve so many strictures. His study of the authors above mentioned is highly commendable, for after all one can say little about Conscience without reference to Catholic moralists. It is also unusually fair, with the result that nowhere does he say that "the end justifies the means" is a Jesuit principle; that he finds that Jesuit theologians are not all lax, that

¹ *Conscience and its Problems, an Introduction to Casuistry*. By Kenneth E. Kirk, Fellow of Trinity College, Oxford, etc. London: Longmans. Pp. xxiv., 377, with additional notes and index. Price, 16s. net. 1927.

Probabilism has a good deal to say for itself, in spite of such absurdities of the late Prof. Rashdall as "the business of the Jesuit Moral Theology was . . . to show people how they could be as bad as possible without suffering for it." He finds that Pascal completely missed the point, though he wrote beautiful French, and that many things which St. Thomas Aquinas said are good and true, though not his categories of mortal sins, a point not understood by the author.

Being so greatly indebted to scholastic theologians, it is a pity that he should speak of the "dead hand of a decayed Scholasticism" (p. 129). To turn, now, to details. The book contains chapters on Conscience, Loyalty, Casuistry, Error, Doubt, Perplexity. The author offers solutions on the subject of Betting and Gambling, General Strikes, Birth-Control, Conflict of Evils, Lies, Commercial Honesty—all matters of immense interest if adequately treated. But we fear that the treatment can be not unfairly suggested by the following dialogue: "What is the colour of this red billiard ball?" "Oh! it depends on your angle of vision." "Well, from your present angle, what is its colour?" "I should prefer to take another angle and compare. We must not be in a hurry to make up our minds. Let us leave decisions to posterity."

We do not wish to be unfair to Mr. Kirk, but really a professed moralist should have definite views, for that is his business, and he should read the Masters in Moral Theology with observant mind. Greatly as we admire the author's erudition and appreciate his general fairness to the classics of Catholic Moral Theology—including, of course, many Jesuit writers—we have discovered so many points to criticize, that a fair-sized book would not suffice to contain them. The following, however, are a few of the criticisms we feel justified in making.

"The unlikelihood that God would allow the Church to err gravely in matters of fundamental importance may be held as a pious theory . . . but on what does the doctrine rest except on a human and perhaps exaggerated interpretation of a Scriptural text (John xvi. 13). Even the sayings of Jesus have come down to us from the pen of the Evangelists; what right have we to assume that they were always correctly reported?" (p. 76). On the author's principle so stated, the whole authority of the Bible might go. If the author does not accept the proofs of the historical veracity of Sacred Scripture, whence is he to derive any Christian apologetic? The author is certainly mistaken in thinking that Pope Alexander VII. condemned the proposition (no. 6) as stated in p. 118. It required no condemnation.

On several so-called Jesuit maxims, the author is less than fair. "In their proper context, some at least of the Jesuit

maxims were not as scandalous as they appear at first sight" (p. 119). The text implies that some were quite as scandalous. Yet, as a fact, no scandalous maxims are, or ever have been, rightly attributed to the teaching of the Society. Every student ought to know that.

We cannot admit, with the author, that a lie can ever be defended; "the pressure of hard cases, of common courtesy, of crises where the lie must be told to avoid irretrievable disaster, is too great to be resisted" (p. 122). A lie as such is a sin, and sin can never be justified. We do not agree that it is "trifling with matters" (p. 137) to determine what is a mortal sin of theft, or when a man can be said to have committed a mortal sin of drunkenness, or what distance from the altar would prevent one being bodily present at Mass. If sane casuistry has any use, it has a purpose here. Again, it is not calculated to inspire respect for the Word of God or for the author's discrimination to say "the Bible, it is true, unhesitatingly condemned all lying; but the Bible also recorded, with complacency, if not with outspoken approval, instances of unblushing mendacity on the part of the patriarchs, their allies and descendants" (p. 183).

St. Joan of Arc was not a nonconformist, nor did the Church call upon her to regard her visions as hallucinations of the devil (p. 217).

The author confuses (on p. 247) two distinct things—the refusal of sacramental absolution and want of jurisdiction over reserved cases. Although he is singularly fair, for an amateur, to the system known as probabilism, he will mislead his readers (p. 265) by his presentation of its history. The objections raised against it were disposed of centuries ago.

In the chapter on birth-control the author does not, as far as we can see, commit himself to any very decided opinion. In asking the question: Is "unnatural" the same as "artificial"? he simply perpetuates a prevalent intellectual muddle, and makes a difficulty out of the confusion. He quotes the resolution of the Lambeth Conference of 1920, and proves to his own satisfaction—but, we sincerely hope, to the consternation of the Bishops then assembled (there were 252)—that they did not condemn birth-control in every case. After dealing at great length with unreal issues on this question, the author devotes the rest of the chapter to sketching the line to be taken by Anglican ministers, in the improbable case of a penitent, guilty of that sin, asking for absolution. For he thinks that no layfolk would under any circumstances submit a question of that sort to their clergy (p. 305). There is, in this chapter, a poignant if vague appeal for "loyalty" to the Prayer Book. "If it be too late, at this time of day, to appeal to the Prayer Book as a determinant of loyalty, is there anything left to which we can appeal"?

The author objects to the expression "attainment of salvation." He says that the phrase is not a popular one in modern usage; "it carries with it a tinge of selfish particularism which is probably better avoided" (p. 271). Yet the attainment of salvation is the one purpose for which all Moral Theology is written and, for that matter, the chief purpose for which the individual was created.

On General Strikes the author has nothing to offer beyond generalities. "Since a General Strike is a war on the community (p. 361) it will be justifiable if the grounds for waging it are sufficiently grave. . . . The problem is a problem of a choice between two evils and two loyalties . . . in a given case, how are we to say which of the two is the least"? The question needs to be discussed in the concrete and, before a decision can be come to, such previous questions as—Are the workers' contracts just and reasonable? Is the community responsible for unjust working conditions? Cannot arbitration secure at less cost all that, and more than, a suicidal strike can achieve?—have to be settled. Mr. Kirk does not seem to have studied this matter adequately.

The author sets up a defence for all schism when he states: "The fact that Anglicanism has rejected a rule" (he is speaking of Fasting Communion and the confession of mortal sin before Holy Communion and of clerical celibacy) "is quite enough in itself to make it [the rule] genuinely doubtful." This begs the question of Anglicanism belonging to the Church of Christ. On Mr. Kirk's principles the Wesleyans have precisely the same right as he claims for Anglicanism, and, indeed, the principle leads to the fantastical plea, "*cujus regio ejus religio*."

Lastly, in speaking about refusal of Communion to the guilty party in a divorce, he states that the logic of facts forces him to admit that "Anglicanism is to-day wholly powerless to deal with unworthy members among the laity, and must suffer the intrusion of any person, however immoral, who chooses to present himself for Communion. In theory this is perhaps true; in practice it is not so true. There still remains the discipline of custom. Opinions will differ both as to the efficacy and as to the adequacy of the discipline of custom. All that can be said here is that the discipline of custom, however low and lax may be the standard which it administers, is at least wholly in accordance with the Catholic conception of the Church." This is one of the many lamentable subterfuges to which the exigencies of the Anglican position reduce its defenders. As if any custom could prevail against the moral law and sanction what would be considered sacrilegious communions! Mr. Kirk, we fear, remains an amateur in his difficult subject, and his book teems with inac-

curacies of fact and interpretation. Naturally, for he is setting up his unsupported judgment as the standard by which to test the divine wisdom of the Church.

3—THE GEOGRAPHY OF WITCHCRAFT¹

THE characteristics which distinguished the author's previous book upon the "History of Witchcraft" are hardly less emphasized in this companion volume which deals with much the same material but arranges it according to countries. We have the same attitude of ultra-orthodoxy, the same belief in the reality of the witches' sabbaths and pacts with the devil, the same quite unnecessary details of the obscene ritual of the cult, and the same utter disregard of all the canons of historical criticism. Can any sober student of history who knows anything of Paris in the reign of Louis XIV. attach credit to such descriptions as the following?

The Host was consecrated, and then the Precious Blood. An assistant crept forward bearing an infant in her arms. The child was held over the altar, a sharp gash across the neck, a stifled cry and warm drops fell into the chalice and streamed upon the white figure beneath. The corpse was handed to la Voisin, who flung it callously into an oven fashioned for that purpose which glowed white-hot in its fierceness. It was proved that a regular traffic had been carried on for years with beggar-women and the lowest prostitutes, who sold their children for that purpose. At her trial la Voisin confessed that no less than two thousand five hundred babies had been disposed of in this manner, for the black mass was continually being celebrated, not only by Guibourg but other priests.

If la Voisin had been content to confess that a score of infants had been sacrificed in that way, we might more easily have believed that there was some foundation in fact for such horrors. But 2,500!! Even if a baby had been murdered every day, it would have taken seven years to reach such a total.

We may be doing Mr. Summers an injustice, but we get the impression that he regards even the execution of children under the age of twelve as a necessary, though drastic, remedy which was not altogether out of proportion with the evil which the witch-hunters strove to combat. He quotes certain statistics regarding the executions at Würzburg (c. 1628)—we are, by

¹ *The Geography of Witchcraft.* By Montague Summers. London: Kegan Paul. Pp. 624. Price, 21s. n. 1927.

the way, by no means satisfied of the reliability of the source from which these data are taken—and in these there occur repeatedly such entries as the following:

Nineteenth execution, six persons. A page at Rotenham was executed at six o'clock in the courtyard of the Town Hall, and his body burned on the following day. The wife of Secretary Schellhar. Another woman. A boy, ten years old. Another boy, twelve years old. A baker's wife named Bögler was burned alive.

Our author's comment at the end of this list of 157 similar executions, including some twenty children and amongst them "a little girl of nine or ten years old with her younger sister," is to the effect that though "such a catalogue at first glance seems horrible to a degree, it must be remembered that these frequent executions only serve to show how deeply gangrened was this unfortunate and unhappy district. . . . The Satanists corrupted old and young, rich and poor. . . . It is sad indeed to read of children who were thus early tainted by evil. Yet such cases persist throughout the ages." The curious thing is that in the end the number of those accused of sorcery became so great that the prosecutions for very shame had to be abandoned. When this occurred and people ceased to talk about the horrors of witchcraft, the supposed practice of magic, instead of breaking out with renewed fury, quietly fell into oblivion and, save as a dead superstition, nothing more has since been heard of it except in holes and corners.

SHORT NOTICES.

THEOLOGICAL.

THE best defence of Catholic doctrine is its lucid exposition. For that reason the series of lectures entitled **The Catholic Church and her Critics**, which were delivered in St. Patrick's Cathedral, Melbourne, in 1926, deserves to be heartily commended. The lectures deal in a popular, non-controversial way with the common difficulties brought against such doctrines as the Divinity of Christ, the indissolubility of marriage, the Sacraments, the Gospels, the Infallibility of the Pope, etc. Eight Jesuits, two Dominicans and two Secular Priests contribute to the series, with the result that variety of style and treatment is ensured. The lectures are straightforward, interesting, and genuinely helpful. Among so many excellent papers, it is difficult to choose, but we think that the essay of the editor, Father Albert Power, S.J., "Why insist on Doctrine?" and the essay entitled "Is the Doctrine of Evolution incompatible with Catholicism?" deserve special mention. The book as a whole ought

to prove of very real service to members of the Catholic Evidence Guild and others who have the good ambition to be able to give an account of the faith that is in them. It is published by the Advocate Press, Melbourne. Price not mentioned, but probably about 2s. 6d.

There is an unquestionable advantage in taking one's theology from a great thinker who is also a writer of nearly perfect prose. That advantage may be had from the study of Abbé Sepiéter's recent book, *La Doctrine Catholique tirée des Oeuvres de Bossuet* (Lethielleux: 20 francs). Bossuet was born on September 27, 1627, so we take keen pleasure in recommending this excellent anthology of his thought and devotion in September, 1927. Praise of that great man would be three hundred years too late. He can get as much splendid suggestion into a sentence as lesser men can convey only after striving through pages.

PHILOSOPHICAL.

We have already, in these columns, introduced our readers to the important work, *Handbuch der Philosophie*, published by Oldenbourg of Munich. Since our last notice, ten new fascicules have appeared, and our impression of the thoroughness and philosophical competence of the work has been confirmed. Some of the subjects are of a highly special character, on which the average mortal scarcely feels himself entitled to an opinion. How many reviewers, we wonder, will judge themselves competent to appraise the contributions by Professor A. Forke, of Hamburg, on the philosophy of the Chinese in all its branches—logic, metaphysics, cosmology, ethics, politics and psychology? Dr. Hermann Weyl will have a larger, but still a very select, public for his two numbers on "Philosophie der Mathematik und Naturwissenschaft," in which the most recent problems of mathematical logic are discussed. Of subjects less severely specialized, Dr. E. Rothacker writes on Logic and Theory of Knowledge, Dr. Emil Brunner expounds the Philosophy of Religion from the standpoint of Evangelical Theology, while Dr. A. Dempf and Dr. T. Litt deal with Ethics in mediæval and modern times. Naturally a large variety of outlook is represented, but what impresses one most is the wide range of thought and investigation in every branch. It is not possible to hold that the present age is indolent in matters philosophical. If there is uncertainty and vagueness about some very important questions, there is at all events a vigorous effort to secure a central point of view and a synthesis. Of this praiseworthy effort the "Handbuch" is a notable example which no student of the modern development in philosophy can afford to ignore.

APOLOGETIC.

The Rev. W. H. Russell has compiled an elementary course in Apologetics, which he calls *Your Religion* (Herder: 7s.), after a novel fashion intended to emphasize the fact that religion primarily means love and imitation of a divine Person, and that the best way to know truth is to live it. This course is the outcome of many years' class-instruction, and it will, we feel, prove very stimulating to religious teachers and not a little helpful to their pupils.

DEVOTIONAL.

The following six books are from M. Téqui's establishment in Paris: **Sermons de Carême**, par Abbé Duplessy (5 frs.), good, simple instructions on Lenten themes; **Lectures Évangéliques pour tous les jours du Mois de Marie**, par R. P. Alexis de Barbezieux, meditations on Our Lady based on the Gospels, with nothing very special to recommend them; **Petit Traité de la Connaissance de Marie**, par G. J. Chaminade (3 frs.), a book that has the distinction of coming from the pen of one whose cause of beatification has been introduced at Rome; **Rejoignez-vous dans le Seigneur**, par Chan. P. Feige (6 frs.), considerations on the various motives for spiritual joy; **La Famille**, par L. Rouzic (5 frs.), a small but solid little treatise on the duties and privileges of parents and children; **Le Père**, par L. Rouzic (5 frs.), a more detailed account of the duties of a father of a family by an author who has already dealt with the mothers of families and is preparing further treatises on grandparents, brothers and sisters, servants, etc.,—in fact, a complete theological course, speculative and devotional, on the fourth commandment.

Number 13 of the Orchard Books is Walter Hilton's **Scale of Perfection**, with an introduction by Dom M. Noetinger of Solesmes (B.O. and W.: 5s.). This is certainly the most convenient and attractive edition of the famous classic ever published.

M. Paul Féron-Vrau, finding that the war has paralysed most of the Catholic movements in France, thought he might help the cause of his fellow Catholics by publishing a small work on Indulgences. In his **Petit Traité Pratique des Indulgences** (La Bonne Presse: 5.00 fr.) he has brought out a work which is a proof of his piety and industry. After a short general sketch of Indulgences, he states the general conditions necessary to gain them, and then goes on to give a list of those which may be gained by all who do not belong to Confraternities, pious associations or third orders. This section, therefore, includes an account of the ordinary scapulars and beads. The third section deals with a very great number of Confraternities, the conditions of admission to them and the Indulgences which may be gained by their members, and ends with an account of the great "third orders." Then come four appendices: the first contains a list of the plenary Indulgences which can be gained every day: the second, those which may be gained every week: the third, the partial Indulgences which are available every day: the fourth gives a practical list of useful addresses, viz., the addresses of religious houses to which application must be made for faculties reserved to them, and of the head centres of the various Confraternities. The work is very complete, has been put together with great care and should prove of great use.

Mlle J. Burret's admirable treatise **L'Éducation religieuse de l'Enfant** (Bonne Presse: 5.00 fr.) will be of great assistance to parents and teachers. She divides her subject into education given individually—by the mother or her representative and collectively—at school, and shows how exact yet how carefully graduated it ought to be.

A clear understanding of the nature of a Retreat and solid reflections constituting its substance are to be found in a little volume called

Lettres à un Retraitant, by Mgr. Roland-Gosselin, Coadjutor Bishop of Versailles.

HISTORICAL.

Members of the Society of St. John Chrysostom and others who are interested in the Eastern Churches will find much that is enlightening in Father Raymond Janin's account of the various Eastern rites, in **Les Eglises Orientales et les Rites Orientaux** (La Bonne Presse: 15.00 fr.), the second edition of a valuable book, wherein the author has tried to give a correct account of the changes brought about by the war. His plan is simple and businesslike. First we have an account of the rite and its usages. Then comes an account of the Churches, or group of Churches, which belong to the rite, their organization, relations to the civil power and history. A special chapter in each division is given to the Catholic sections of the rite. In this way the Byzantine, Armenian, Syrian, Chaldean, Maronite, and Coptic rites are described. The last chapter deals with the Union of the Churches. This gives an account of the policy of the Holy See, and it might well be amplified, in view of the difficulties to be overcome and the means best likely to succeed. There are many helpful illustrations and eight tables of statistics. There is no attempt at style and no rhetoric, but a plain statement of the facts got together from trustworthy quarters. A most interesting book.

Very happy in the occasion of its appearance is the history of Catholic growth in China, compiled by Father Pascal M. D'Elia, S.J., of the Shanghai University, and called **Catholic Native Episcopacy in China**: an outline of the formation and growth of the Chinese Catholic clergy, 1300—1926. We have always held that the Faith is never completely established in any country until it is officered and administered mainly by natives of that land. It is the large proportion of indigenous Catholic clergy in China at this moment that gives to our missions there, during the present upheaval, a stability to which those of the sects cannot pretend. Not a year has yet passed since the Holy Father by making Bishops of six Chinese priests put the Church there on a normal footing. No doubt the Chinese Church will need help from outside for many a long year, but now she has within herself the means of growth and expansion. Father D'Elia's account, written curiously enough "at the request of several of our Protestant friends," is invaluable as an historical and statistical record, and should be eagerly perused by all interested in the Church's missionary enterprise.

LITERARY.

The third volume of Father Brou's admirable work, **Le Dix-Huitième Siècle littéraire** (Téqui: 12 frs.), deals with Rousseau, the *Philosophes* of Louis XVI.'s reign, Bernardin de Saint-Pierre, Beaumarchais, André Chenier and the various minor worthies. Father Brou has a beautifully lucid way of approaching his subjects, and his criticism and comment are invariably acute, balanced, and suggestive. The long study of Rousseau is particularly valuable, based as it is on Catholic principles and first-rate scholarship.

The Long Road, by Rev. John Gray (Blackwell: 2s.6d.), is a poem the drift of which does not lie on the surface. Here is one stanza of it, out of 160 odd, as intelligible as any other:

The goose-gaggle's strength
defined by cackling overhead
of broods on Kebnekajse bred
by one lithe bird a century led
in great shimmering length.

What is a goose-gaggle, and where, in the name of Kipling, is Kebnekajse? The beginning each line with a lower-case letter suggests that the author has simply cut his prose into lengths, but that would be an unfair inference. Amid its mannerisms and humours and the obscurity incident to all reflective verse, there is here the stuff of poetry. The other shorter poems are more pleasing, but the section called Quatrains displays the brevity rather than the wit of Father Tabb.

LITURGICAL.

As our Holy Week services have their origin in what was done in Jerusalem, the history of the liturgy is a gainer by the description of the Holy Week liturgy at the holy places. This is given by Father J. B. Thibaut of the Assumptionist Fathers in his *Ordre des Offices de la Semaine Sainte à Jerusalem du IV^e au X^e siècle* (La Bonne Presse: 5.00 fr.). The earliest document used is the incomplete "Peregrinatio Eucharistæ," by the Spanish 4th century nun whose name was first given as Silvia and then Etheria. The document next in date is an old Armenian Lectionary which may be of the 5th century. The other two are a Gregorian translation of a Jerusalem liturgical document and a similar Greek one which probably goes back to the 9th or 10th century. As they supplement each other, they provide valuable evidence for the early Holy Week services and their changes with time. A full description is built up on the basis of these documents of the ceremonies of Palm Sunday, Maundy Thursday, Good Friday and Holy Saturday, each document, as far as it testifies, being taken in turn. Father Thibaut mentions the interesting detail that the Roman Rite has alone kept the triple-branched candle in the Holy Saturday ceremonies.

Father Joseph Aertnys, C.S.S.R., was the author of a *Compendium Liturgiæ Sacræ iuxta Ritum Romanum in Missæ celebratione et Officii recitatione*. A ninth edition of this work has been brought out by Father J. M. Pluym, C.S.S.R. (Marietti: 11 lire), who has corrected the old work in accordance with the directions in the new edition of the Missal and the more recent decrees of the Congregation of Rites. After explaining the general rules laid down as to the various actions to be performed, the author takes the reader through the "Ritus Celebrandi Missam" and the rubrics of the Missal, adding instructions on the giving of Communion, the consecration of hosts, the purifying of the ciborium and on duplicating. Votive Masses and Masses for the dead are explained at length. The book closes with an explanation of the rubrics of the breviary. It is a most careful piece of work and, with its frequent references to the rubrics and the pronouncements of the Congregation of Rites, should prove useful for reference.

ASCETICAL.

Books dealing with priestly training are growing fairly numerous, yet we cannot say that any are yet superfluous. The work is so important and its results may have such far-reaching effects that the views and experiences of many minds are very necessary. In **The Priest and his Mission** (Herder: 8s.) Father Lanslots, O.S.B., a well-known ascetical writer, has drawn from a series of articles in an Italian paper the teaching of the late Cardinal Gennari on clerical training, and presented it in a way best calculated to suit our age. The discussion begins naturally with vocation and then concerns itself with seminary training and the priestly office itself. The treatise will interest not only the clergy themselves but all who hope, directly or indirectly, to recruit their ranks.

BIOGRAPHICAL.

Among the many excellent translations of Christian literature for which students are indebted to the S.P.C.K., **The Life of St. Gall** (7s. 6d. net), by Maud Joynt, will not be found the least noteworthy. Miss Joynt contributes an admirable introduction by way of preface to the translation of Walahfrid Strabo's Latin life of the famous Irish missionary, in which all questions as to sources and chronology are thoroughly and learnedly discussed. There is an even and balanced tone in her criticism which inspires confidence. Thus when speaking of mediæval asceticism, which some Catholic writers are given to disparaging, she says: "It is well to bear two considerations in mind. In the first place, these austerities did not appear so extreme to the ruder ages in which they were practised as they do to us, who are accustomed to a widely different standard of civilization—probably too of different nervous organization. In the next place be it remembered that every age has its own ideals in religion, generally the opposite of its besetting vices. To the grossness, sensuality and unbridled licence which pervaded European society in the time of the Merovingian kings, the Christian monks opposed an ideal which asserted the supremacy of spirit over body and set a special value on self-control and chastity. The greatness of the evil called for a drastic remedy; and the austerities of the mediæval saints no doubt helped average men to attain a higher level of decency." To those in search of trustworthy information about the lovable disciple of St. Columbanus, who impressed himself so strongly and strangely on the imagination of Europe in a dreary epoch, this book will prove invaluable.

Les Deux Frères, par Mgr. Baunard (La Bonne Presse: 14 frs.), is a pleasantly illustrated account of the two saintly employers, Philibert Vrau and Camille Feron-Vrau. Philibert died in 1905 and Camille three years later. Mgr. Baunard was their friend and counsellor in much of their charitable and social work. The story he has to tell is a noble and inspiring one. Some capable member of the Catholic Social Guild ought to translate it into English. If all employers were like the Vraus, even faintly like them, our social evils would vanish in a generation.

Le Bienheureux Noël Pinot, par Alexis Crosnier (Beauchesne: 12 frs.), is the picturesquely written story of a French curé who was guillotined

during the Terror and recently beatified by Pope Pius XI. The state of the Church in France during the Revolution is well described in these pages, but their chief merit is the adequate delineation of a very noble-hearted country priest.

Les plus belles lettres de Sainte Catherine de Sienne, traduites par Paul-Henri Michel (Lethielleux: 10 frs.), is of value to the English reader, who already possesses good versions of St. Catherine in his own language, chiefly for the *avant-propos* of Père Gillet, O.P., on the spiritual teaching of the Saint.

No better monument could be reared to the memory of Miss Hickey, one of our few Catholic poetesses, than a due combination of her "life" and her "work," and no better architect could have been chosen for the task than Miss Enid Dinnis, herself so well endowed with the poetic faculty. In **Emily Hickey: Poet, Essayist, Pilgrim** (Harding and More: 7s. 6d.) Miss Dinnis draws a faithful picture of her friend, in herself and in her literary connections, which, to those who knew her only in her later Catholic days, were surprisingly lofty and select. Our readers will already have learnt much about this gracious life and its achievements from two essays, published by Miss Dinnis in our pages, concerning the poetess. This little volume unites an appreciation full of insight, a delicate criticism expressed in worthy literary form and a loving affection with such a selection of the best work of the poet as will make the reader wonder how she could have remained so comparatively unknown. The reason is that she gladly bartered poetic fame for the gift of faith.

NON-CATHOLIC.

The Spirit of Glory, by F. W. Drake (Longmans: 4s. 6d.), is a series of devout meditations on the Holy Ghost, in which a Catholic will find nothing whatever to object to and a great deal that is helpful.

FICTION.

A new collection of Miss Enid Dinnis' stories called **Travellers' Tales** (Sands: 3s. 6d. n.) are distinguished by the brilliant qualities which characterize all her imaginative work—a sense of the supernaturalness of persons and things and events, a graceful and delicate humour, literary distinction and the ability to construct an interesting plot. In fact, we may safely say that the more she writes the better is the output.

Out of a very simple incident—a boat with two small boys in it drifting out to sea—Father Jón Svensson, S.J., has made a charming little story which has been as charmingly translated by Father M. Bodkin, under the title **Lost in the Arctic** (Irish Catholic Truth Society: 2s.) and would make an exceptionally good gift-book for boys and girls.

MISCELLANEOUS.

De la Vocation d'Ecrivain chrétien, par A. Décout (Beauchesne: 12 frs.), is a piece of work full of encouragement and good advice for young aspirants to literary laurels. All very well, the sceptic in us says,

but you do not make an effective writer by telling him to look to his prayers, etc., etc., etc. With all respect, we fear that there is something rather grandmotherly and academic about this method of fashioning Shakespeares.

The Greek Refugee Settlement (Geneva: 2s.6d.) is a publication of the League of Nations that will interest people who wish to know how wide and well-cultivated is the field of the League's activities. It is extremely well illustrated and has some excellent coloured maps in a pocket at the end. How such books can be sold for half-a-crown is truly astonishing. It may be obtained in London from Messrs. Constable and Co.

Actes de Benoit XV., t.III. (La Bonne Presse: 4 frs.), is a most useful collection, Latin and French, covering the year 1920—1921. This, the concluding volume, contains a good analytical index to the entire work.

"La Bonne Presse" is thoroughly Catholic in its outlook in more senses than one. The latest addition to its "Bibliothèque du Laboureur" is a delightful little work in a red cover entitled **Causeries sur l'Agriculture en général**, par J. Valentin (8 frs.). Everybody who has a market garden or even an allotment patch ought to procure this book. It tells all about the vagaries of soil, about manures, about the weather question, about bad birds, etc., etc. There are 65 jolly sketches of all kinds of ploughs and things, as well as of carrots carrying on under ground, and fearsome machines that emit a kind of smoke detested by crows. Altogether a treasure of a book for any one fond of a bit of farming.

MINOR PUBLICATIONS.

Father McNabb makes a useful contribution to the Anglican controversy by the publication from *Blackfriars* of an essay, collecting and collating the various admissions made by Anglican scholars of the first rank, past and present, with regard to St. Peter's Primacy. Amongst these, we note with surprise, is the anti-papalist Bishop of Gloucester, whilst the "Anglo-Catholic" Bishop Gore figures as a denier of the Petrine prerogative. The pamphlet which is called **Anglican Witness to St. Peter** (Blackfriars: Oxford: price, 3d.) will encourage those who are working for the conversion of our separated brethren.

A learned essay, **Greek Aesthetics**, sent us by the author, Mr. Claude C. H. Williamson, leaves no very clear impression, for all its wealth of quotation and deep analysis, beyond that the theory of the Greeks was inadequate because they lacked the experiences that come with Christianity.

Those who read of the difficulties of approach between the Western and Eastern minds, dealt with elsewhere in this issue, will find further enlightenment in the spiritual autobiography of Mr. J. B. Ghosal, entitled **My Home Coming** (Indian C.T.S.: 3 annas per part), the 2nd and 3rd portions of which have reached us. Here we see a cultured intelligence fully acquainted with all that is to be said for Hinduism, yet finding it point by point inferior to Christianity—a religion which possesses, if the

Eastern only knew it, all that his cults can give him, without any trace of their immorality and falseness.

Several important new pamphlets have lately been issued at 2d. by the C.T.S. Of these the chief is **Miracles**, by the Rev. Fr. Knox, a masterly treatment of the subject in 32 pages, lightened and enforced by the author's lively style. **A Day in the Life of our Lord**, by the Rev. Francis Clarke, collects together certain Gospel teachings and incidents with a devotional and expository commentary as a means of realizing what may have been a typical day in the active life of Christ our Model. A very useful pamphlet, **Holy Images and the Crucifix**, by the late Father S. Smith, has been carefully revised by Father Lattey, S.J. **Eyes to the Blind** is a well-written and interesting story by Father Bearne, and the same may be said of "**Henry the Second**": a story of School-life, by Father M. Bodkin, S.J. More than a dozen reprints, including **The Gospel according to St. Luke**, are a gratifying proof of the constant demand for useful pamphlets.

A new missionary magazine—**The African Missions of the White Fathers**—issued every two months from the Priory, Bishop's Waltham, at a yearly subscription of 2s., made its appearance in July—August, and will serve to keep the faithful aware of the wonderful work done by Cardinal Lavigerie's heroic sons in North and Mid Africa. We learn from its statistical tables that 221 Priests, 115 Brothers and 600 Sisters belonging to the Congregation have nearly half a million Christians in their charge and some 190,000 catechumens.

In a series called "The Popular Liturgical Library," published by the Liturgical Press, Collegeville, Minn., appears as No. 4 a dainty little booklet containing the rite of Baptism in Latin and English, edited by Rev. R. E. Power and called **The Gift of Life** (10 cents a copy).

The America Press reprints as a 5 cent pamphlet the timely and valuable historical essays, called **The Catholic Attitude Towards Conferences on Christian Unity**, wherein, in the quarterly *Thought*, the Rev. W. H. McClellan, S.J., traced historically and dogmatically the various approaches made during the last century to the Catholic Church by those who feel the scandal of disunion yet are unwilling to pay the price of unity. Father McClellan writes with much inner knowledge and a proper appreciation of the gravity of the question, and his papers should do much to guide and correct Catholic thought on the subject.

The recent issues of the **Catholic Mind** (America Press: 5 cents each) deal with such questions as Evolution, The Social Problem, Catholic Leadership, and Continuity (reproducing Cardinal Bourne's York address).

Father Newdigate, S.J., Vice-Postulator of the Cause gives an interesting *aperçu*, in **The Lancashire Martyrs** (National Congress Office: Manchester: 1d.), of the career of those heroes of the Faith who witnessed to the old Religion in Lancashire during Elizabeth's persecution.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(Reviewed in present issue or reserved for future notice.)

- BAKER, London.**
Letters of Saint Teresa: Appendix to Fourth Volume. Translated by the Benedictines of Stanbrook and edited by F. B. Zimmerman, O.D.C. Pp. 34. Price, 1s. 6d.
- BEAUCHESNE, Paris.**
Pour qu'on lise Cournot. By F. Mentré. Pp. viii. 245. Price, 20.00 fr. *Histoire de Notre-Dame de Lourdes.* By L.-J.-M. Cros, S.J. 2^e edit. Vols. II. and III. Pp. 490, 285. Price, 36.00 fr., 28.00 fr. respectively.
- DUFFY & Co., Dublin.**
Songs and Poems. By George Sigerson. Pp. 72. Price, 3s. 6d.
- GILL & Son, Dublin.**
Mental Prayer according to the Teaching of St. Thomas Aquinas. By Rev. D. Fahey, C.S.Sp. Pp. 77. Price, 2s. 6d. n. *The Soul of the Apostolate.* By Dom Chautard, O.C.R. Translated by Rev. J. A. Moran, S.M. Pp. ix. 266. Price, 3s. n. *Canon Sheehan.* By Rev. Francis Boyle. Pp. 95.
- HERDER, Freiburg im B.**
Wasser aus dem Felsen. By Dr. P. W. V. Keppler. Pp. viii. 380. Price, 4.40 m. *Uebenteuer aus den Inseln.* By Jón Stenßon. Pp. 324. Price, 4.60 m.
- LA PENSEE, Liège.**
Questiones de Embryologia. By Rev. B. H. Merkelbach, O.P. Pp. 88. Price, 8.00 fr.
- LETHIELLEUX, Paris.**
Tractatus Dogmatici. By the Rev. Edward Hugon, O.P. 3 Vols. 5^a edit. From 800 to 900 pages each. Price, 50.00 fr. each.
- LONGMANS, London.**
The House of Martha at Bethany. By H. J. Heuser, D.D. Pp. x. 261.
- MARI E MARIETTI, Turin.**
Praelectiones Biblicae in Novum Testamentum. Auctore R. P. Hadriano Simón, C.S.S.R. Pp. xxviii. 526. Price, 32 lire. *Tractatus Canonico-Moralis de Sacramentis.* Vol. II. De
- Pœnitentia.* Auctore F. M. Cappello, S.J. Pp. xii. 896. Price, 32 lire.
- MUSEUM LESSIANUM, Louvain.**
Baius et le Baianisme. Par F. X. Jansen, S.J. Pp. viii. 238. Price, 25 fr.
- PUTNAM'S SONS, London.**
The Mind and Face of Bolshevism. By R. Fülöp-Miller. Illustrated. Pp. xv. 308. Price, 21s. n.
- S.P.C.K., London.**
St. Hugh of Lincoln. By Canon R. M. Woolley. Pp. xi. 214. Price, 7s. 6d. *Why I Believe.* By Kenneth Ingram. Pp. vii. 184. Price, 6s. n.
- THE BRUCE PUBLISHING Co., Milwaukee.**
Mirrors of God. By Rev. E. J. Garesché, S.J. Pp. 146. Price, \$1.50.
- TEQUI, Paris.**
Jesus en Croix. By Père Grou. Revised by P. A. Cadrès. Pp. xv. 238. Price, 3.50 fr. *Petite Reine.* By P. Y. Marie, O.Cis. Pp. 23. *Pour Vivre en Beauté.* By Canon H. Morice. Pp. viii. 200. Price, 6.00 fr. "Ma" Messe. By Abbé C. Grimaud. Pp. viii. 257. Price, 9.00 fr. *L'Imagination et les Prodiges.* By Mgr. Elie Mérie. 2 vols. New Edit. Pp. xxxi. 316: 329. Price, 20.00 fr. *Conférences aux Femmes chrétiennes.* Par Mgr. Dupanloup. Pp. xvi. 430. Price, 10 fr. *Histoire de Saint Louis de Gonzague.* Par Daurignac. Pp. viii. 362. Price 10 fr. *La Jeune Fille chrétienne.* Par Ch. Thévenot. Price, 4 fr. *Outre-Tombe.* Par L. Rimbault. Pp. 170. Price, 3.50 fr. *Le Guide spirituel.* Par B. Louis de Blois. Pp. 164. Price, 3.50 fr. *Jésus Christ dans l'Eucharistie.* Par X. Pp. 350. Price, 5 fr. *La Psychothérapie du Dr. Vittor.* Par P. D'Espiney. Pp. 40. Price, 2 fr.
- WICKERSHAM PRESS, Lancaster, Pa.**
Are Mediums really Witches? By J. P. Tuohy. Pp. 115. Price, \$1.75.

.
.
.

n.
s.
e,

on
4.
se.
ii.

J.
6.

ou.
p.
ite
is.
en

ce.
fr.
C.
ce,
les

rie.
xi.
fr.
ré-

up.
fr.
de

ac.
La
Par

fr.
im-

fr.
B.
64.

rist
X.
La

tox.
40.

By
rice,